The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

It was probably sometime in 1920—old diaries disappear—that Lord Rutherford, then Sir Ernest, was persuaded to address a meeting in Manchester outside the University in order to explain something of his explorations into the constitution of the atom and the almost fabulous energies which might be released by atomic disintegration, which, it was being said, were the subject of mysterious experiments he had been conducting in the physics laboratory in Oxford Road, experiments which, again it was being said, might conceivably have begun a series of chain reactions which even he would be unable to stop (and how true that was!) But no mysterious explosions had been observed or reported, so the world wasn't going to blow up because a few atoms had been bombarded to pieces (but how uncertain *that is*!). So it was a curious, rather than an excited, audience of business men with an odd parson here and there that listened to a masterly exposition of the nuclear constitution of the atom and thought it understood enough of it to realize that under our hands there was a source of energy which some day might well revolutionize our practical life. Perhaps Rutherford saw that we were associating too quickly and too easily this universal power with the price of coal, for at the end of his exposition he warned his audience that if any of us was thinking of a new cheap form of manufacturing energy, we could dismiss any idea that what he had discovered and described would be of any practical use for a very long time to come. His work was experimental research. It was a long, long way from his laboratory to the factory.

* * *

Within twenty-five years the atom bomb had devastated Hiroshima: within thirty years the construction of the hydrogen bomb, said to be a thousand times more powerful, has begun! At this frightening speed science loads responsibilities upon us. Nor can we escape them by trying to devise some new version of the parlour game which consists of thrusting upon one's neighbour some article which has been thrust upon us till, when the music stops, the unfortunate person in possession pays a forfeit. For on whom shall we thrust the responsibility of deciding whether to make and to

VOL. XXVIII, NO. 2, APRIL, 1950. A

use the H. bomb, or the A. bomb, or indeed the H.E. bomb, or any other kind of bomb? Mr. Truman or Mr. Attlee-Churchill or Mr. Stalin or the Pope or the Lambeth Conference or the Assembly of the Congregational Union? The question is absurd. None of these in his or its own right has the authority to impose a decision about the use of atomic energy upon mankind. Such authority as any of them has is derived from the only source of authority, under God, which exists, which is the spirit of man. The truth about so many of our shifts and evasions, our shrinking from moral responsibility, is thus forced upon us. Nor can the scientists themselves assume the responsibility of decision. What they discover is not their property. That way lies anarchy. In the lesser matters of the law we can spin cocoons around ourselves, but here there can be no pretence nor evasion. And no one can contract out. To refuse to share in the decision is itself to decide. The pacifist may withdraw from the conflict and leave the rest of us to our fate, or worse, may, as Dr. Inge says, "stroke the tiger and murmur 'Poor Puss'," but for three hundred years we have struggled to create a Christian democracy and we must abide by what we have done. It is true we hear much in these days about various kinds of authority whose existence reproves our democratic arrogance and ignorance. Well, if they do exist let them state their claim here where it matters and now before it is too late.

* * *

It would be so much easier if these authoritarians were right. If God had not made man in His own image, able to discern his right hand from his left and free to choose between life and death. Why, we may cry in the agony of decision, did He not make us robots instead of men? Life would then be so much easier. It would be as easy as death. But in His infinite wisdom he has made us to be sons, free to make our bed in hell if we will, but free too, to find our way back, through our most blessed Saviour, to our Father's hearth and home.

* * *

In the old pagan myth Prometheus stole fire from heaven. Has a more daring thief now broken through to steal an even greater power, and as the avenging eagle tore the living flesh of the predatory blasphemer will a jealous God destroy the world we share with Him? No. Man's wealth of knowledge and the power to get it are the dangerous gifts of God. We cannot hand them back. To use them wrongly is always possible and, but for His forgiving grace, fatal. But to use them rightly is life indeed. What we cannot do, and now we know it, is to call upon someone else to lead us into heaven, or save us from hell.

* * *

ALL this, it may be said, is not very helpful in a desperate situation such as this. But there is something at stake more important than that we should be helped out of our difficulties. It is that we should, in discharging our inescapable responsibilities, cultivate the power to help ourselves until we grow into the fullness of the stature of men in Christ. We have pursued our materialistic studies to the point of danger. Need we have failed so disastrously in the study of man and his responsibilities to his fellow men and to God? It is late, but it is never too late for God. In times of obvious peril we have called one another to Days of Prayer. A Day of Prayer for the right use of atomic energy would not be a waste of time.

Between the stirrup and the ground
I mercy ask'd, I mercy found.

* * *

THE present suggestion is that a fresh approach should be made to Russia. We have no doubt it ought to be made if any evidence can be found to suggest it would be received. Whatever is happening behind the Iron Curtain, the acute danger of war seems to be passing. No Power begins a war it is not certain of winning. That certainly died with Hitler. The time may come when Russia will abandon the threat of war which, despite the absurdities of Communistic propaganda, no one else in the world contemplates except with horror. As soon as Russia is able to speak the truth as the rest of the world understands it and shows a readiness to keep the engagements she enters into, negotiations about atomic energy and other horrific forms of warfare can and, we have no doubt, will begin. Meantime there is good hope that as in the case of gas and bacterial warfare during the second world war, the fear of reprisals will be a sufficient deterrent.

* * *

THE most remarkable thing about the Commonwealth Conference at Colombo in January is that it was held at all, and amid the pressure of events its significance might easily be missed. Less than five years ago Asian nationalism regarded the Commonwealth as its enemy. Since then, India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma have achieved independence, not merely without bloodshed, but with the goodwill of the supposed enemy. And they have freely elected to remain within the Commonwealth, a decision which may be even more important to the world than the Communist victory in China. If China denies herself to the rest of the world except Russia, hers may be greater loss, but the Asian peoples who have become independent members of a free Commonwealth have the opportunity of drawing upon those elements of Western technique and culture which in their own judgment are found to be helpful. That they will need help is plain enough. During the thirty years

between 1891 and 1921 the population of India alone rose from 280 millions to 306 millions. In 1941 a total population of 389 millions was recorded, and it is expected that within the next twenty-five years it may exceed 500 millions. This is the situation that confronts the Indian statesmen who realize very well that their friendly association with a world-wide Commonwealth holds prospects which cannot lightly be cast aside. The importance of the Conference in the mind of the British Government was indicated by the strength of its delegation headed by the Foreign Secretary in person. Here is an illustration and example of diversity in unity which the Church ought to have been teaching the world, but from which it must be ready to learn.

* * *

THE *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congregational Council* edited by Frederick L. Fagley (Pilgrim Press and Independent Press, pp. 204 Cloth, 7s. 6d., paper 5s.) is now available and is excellent reading for all Congregationalists and fellow travellers. The Wellesley conference was attended by a wider representation of Congregationalism than any of its predecessors and there were distinguished visitors enough for us all to be reminded that there is a very great company of men and women throughout the world who have accepted the gift of freedom and fellowship through Christ (which was the theme of the conference), some of us born of the flesh in the great Free Church tradition, others, indistinguishable in utterance, born of the Spirit into the brotherhood. Our two preachers were the Rev. Leslie E. Cooke and the Right Reverend Bishop Sabapathy Kulandrum of the United Church of South India. Their themes were strikingly similar. Mr. Cooke found his text in the book of Jeremiah, "Then Zedekiah the King sent and fetched him; and the king asked him secretly in his house and said, Is there any word from the Lord? And Jeremiah said, 'There is'. The Bishop found his in the book of Isaiah, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken.' Both sermons were preaching of the highest order, which if it was less precise than it might have been gave a noble setting to the whole work of the conference. It is possible to feel on reviving personal memories by reading these Proceedings—indeed impossible not to feel—that Congregationalism is splendidly equipped both intellectually and spiritually to make an indispensible contribution to the Church of Christ in the world. But the time when our underlying principles of churchmanship and its inferences could be assumed to be self evident has gone even in America and Britain. We hope therefore that the widest use will be made by churches and Unions throughout the world of the Statement, CONGREGATIONALISM IN ITSELF, IN ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH AND FOR THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE WORLD. It is

concise, simple in language, sound historically and theologically, and calculated to make a direct appeal to those many people on the fringe of the Christian fellowship who feel but little attracted by the elaborate apparatus with which the saving Gospel of Christ is so often overloaded.

* * *

For the first time young people representing the youth of sixteen countries were an official part of the conference. As well as attending the formal meetings of the Council, they held a conference within a conference and issued their own message to the young people of the world-wide fellowship.

The missionary enterprise was well represented by delegates nominated by the London Missionary Society as well as the delegations from the younger churches. Evangelism is implicit in the very nature of Congregationalism. The very important questions that arise out of the nature of the relationships between the younger churches and the older churches in Britain and America were not explored by the conference and occasionally it became obvious that there was need for clearer thinking. It is a subject which lends itself to some helpful discussion in this journal.

We cordially commend these *Proceedings* to our readers.

* * *

All Congregationalists on this side of the Atlantic, and indeed throughout the world feel nothing but sympathy for the temporary confusion into which our sister churches in U.S.A. have been thrown as the result of the decision of the Courts that the Basis of Union which had been widely, but not universally, accepted by them and by the Evangelical and Reformed Church as the instrument of their merger is bad in law. The judgment of the Court said obviously enough that in Congregationalism no Union or Association could use authority upon individual churches nor act for them except at their request, each being legally and spiritually autonomous. We have been accustomed to say in this country that the authority of our Unions and Assemblies is 'ministerial not magisterial', but we have sometimes gone on to act as though those two words held no differences of meaning. Some of our brethren have felt the need for some convenient authority, more sharply defined and more easily organized than the slow moving fellowship of autonomous churches. The contribution of Congregationalism to the Church of Christ in the world does not lie along the line of a united front, to using the same words often to mean different things—there are powerful tendencies at work in this generation that need no such help from us. Our function within the ecumenical movement and the world is to feed and strengthen and give spiritual direction to those profound and mysterious movings in the spirit of man to responsibility and

fellowship, among all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues. It is being done in politics under the stress of necessity. What an opportunity to impress upon the world the effectual power of Christian grace is being offered and scorned by those who insist that they only are the people of God and are sufficiently in the confidence of the Lord of creation to condemn their fellows to the outermost courts!

* * *

Our American brethren with their great resources of piety and wisdom will seek and find the way out of their present difficulties, and the rest of us will watch with deep sympathy as well as great interest. And as we watch we shall learn. We must not ignore, we need not lament, disguise or apologize for our distinctive polity as Congregationalists; rather are we called upon for clearer thought and more vigorous speech about the spiritual convictions and principles which make us what we are. And in doing so, we may serve our day and generation more truly than we know, for these insights which have been given us and sometimes seem to burden us are what two generations have fought to preserve in the common life of mankind. Why are we not teaching the world by practice as well as precept that diversity need be no bar to unity?

* * *

The Roman Catholic agitation for the revision of the Education Act of 1944, on which more general agreement was reached than ever before, has some curious features. It was timed in relation to the General Election to consolidate the Roman Catholic vote in order that it might be used as a bait or threat in the constituencies. Speeches were made by members of the hierarchy, articles appeared in newspapers (we wonder how many were refused!), the organization of processions in London had to be forbidden by the police—in fact there were many of the signs of a political technique more familiar on the Continent than in this country. This renewed demand for public money to provide denominational teaching is supported by the insulting assumption—and indeed sometimes, assertion—that apart from Roman Catholic schools Christian education is not and cannot be given. We have nothing but respect for the Roman Catholic conscience. We also have consciences, and where and when conscience has moved us we have found the necessary money.

It is important that this demand should be resisted. The freedom of this country depends upon the open debate of controversial issues and conflicting claims. A clerical party that takes its orders from outside puts itself into the same dangerous category as any other party that owes a foreign allegiance. The demand is unreasonable. The method of its presentation is something worse.

Free men have as little to hope for from the Vatican as from the Kremlin. It must be our constant endeavour to save ourselves and the civilized world from being shut up to a choice between them.

* * *

A MONUMENTAL history of the civilian war effort of this country is introduced by *British War Economy* by Professor W. H. Hancock and Mr. M. M. Gowing (H.M. Stationery Office, pp. xvii and 583, 21s.). No less than nineteen further volumes are in preparation and the whole series will provide an authoritative account of an industrial nation at war such as has never before been undertaken. In modern war the home front and the battle front have become inseparable; strategy and economics are two parts of one whole. This volume is therefore divided into three periods marked by the great strategical crises, the fall of France, Pearl Harbour and the invasion of Normandy. Though the theme of the book is the effort of the British people, this is put into its proper international setting. Thus economic aid to Russia and the co-operation with France and the United States are carefully examined. As the stupendous effort is analysed, the sweat, if not the blood and tears, of a whole nation makes its impression and the vast material cost of the war to Britain emerges. Nothing like this has ever been done by a free people, and, please God, nothing like it will ever need to be done again. And following the cost, a vast amount of it paid by the current sacrifices of the people, the great deal left remains as a continuing burden, which is the better understood when its origins are explained. The war-time beginnings of the State-controlled economy are also made clear and inferentially many of our current problems. This volume necessarily makes its demands upon the reader's attention, for it is meant to comply with the exacting standards of the professional historian. But it is brilliantly written, and if the general reader pursues the series no further than to the end of the present volume, he will be abundantly rewarded.

It is greatly to be hoped that this book and its successors will be widely read in the United States. Events are moving so quickly that much may be forgotten or overlooked that ought to be known and remembered. Our debt to our American friends is very great. The world's debt to Britain is great, too. A nation capable of the sustained sacrificial effort here described may well be temporarily exhausted, but the evidence of skill, adaptability and vitality here set out will do much to restore our faith in ourselves where it is shaken and maintain our friends' faith in us.

* * *

A RETIRED missionary was addressing an A.T.S. group near Bristol during the war. Among the questions which followed his talk was

one that asked the number of Christians in China. The missionary gave an estimated figure, only to be routed by a member of the audience who observed brightly, "Then I suppose the rest of the Chinese are Church of England!"

(Did the questioner come from a part of England where the Christians, i.e. Bible Christians, are a recognized and familiar denomination, so that it is possible to be told, "O no. He is not a Christian: he's a Congregationalist?)"

* * *

Dr. W. R. Inge in his *Diary of a Dean* (Hutchinson, 21s.) frequently marvels at the great congregations and audiences that came to hear him preach and lecture, not only in this country. There is nothing in this book to explain it. This is a social document covering a phase of English life that has now passed away and there is little here to awaken much regret. It is concerned with the activities rather than the message of a dignitary of the English Church who if he had been a lesser man would have been lost in his office. He was appointed by Asquith who wished to revive the literary traditions associated with St. Paul's and probably to balance the charming simplicity of the then Bishop of London. His vast erudition, his complete mastery of his material, his pellucid, epigramatic style, his sincerity and fearlessness, his religious humility and prophetic insight, these are great gifts which shine through all that he writes. His message to his generation is conveyed in his books, many of which were destroyed in the blitz which gutted the premises of Messrs. Longmans, his publishers. His loyalty to the Church of England was never allowed to disguise from himself or his readers his impatience with pretentious humbug in ecclesiastical dress. It was not his work as Dean, but the work he did while he was Dean, that was important, for he was a Christian thinker and prophet, who knew where the intellectual shoes of his generation pinched and never sought refuge in concepts that beg the very questions they purport to answer. He was not a reformer and found it not only possible but enjoyable to minister to the aristocracy of wealth as well as intellect. He respected the Free Churches but was too little of a democrat to care deeply about much of their life, except the Quakers "whom I love, but in foreign politics their heads are in the clouds". The glimpses Dr. Inge gives of his home life are very beautiful.

* * *

One story from the Diary. Sir John Evans, father of Sir Arthur, was a collector of coins. A party was inspecting a coin, believed to be unique, when it suddenly vanished. The host insisted that everyone must be searched. Sir John refused. Presently the coin

was found under the table, upon which Sir John opened his purse and showed another specimen of the coin.

* * *

THE result of the General Election, announced as we go to press, was not unexpected. The Gallup polls on this occasion had rightly indicated the state of public opinion. A world-wide discussion of its meaning and consequences has begun and it is already suggested that the jury having disagreed a new trial becomes necessary. There is nothing to suggest that any real change in opinion will take place within a few months and much to suggest that the present result is the expression of the judgment of the country that a period of gestation is required for the revolution which has been accomplished during the last Parliament to be tried, tested and winnowed by experience. Nationalization is a principle neither to be universally applied nor totally rejected, but to be used as and when it becomes necessary in the development of the 'responsible community'. Time is needed to find out whether more of it is needed or some of it rejected. On the other hand, the Conservative Party could not offer a convincing alternative policy nor shake off the incubus of catastrophic failures during the years between the wars.

* * *

THE Liberal Party has fared so badly that it clearly has little chance of revival, probably because so much liberalism is common to all parties except the Communists, who disappear as a political force and will now probably go underground. Much will depend on how the two million Liberals scattered about the country will vote in the absence of candidates of their own. They will be assiduously wooed, for the decision at the next Election may very well rest with them.

* * *

LITTLE was said during the campaign about the grave issues involved in foreign policy. In essentials the distinctions between the parties probably do not amount to serious differences, and a real co-operation in foreign affairs is not only essential but possible.

* * *

EXTREME party measures are, of course, ruled out, and as a result the critical economic and foreign situation will receive the attention they demand from both Government and Parliament. Both parties have received their instructions to eschew extravagances of policy and to find a common denominator, for neither commands sufficient confidence to legislate as if it and its supporters alone were the country. Once, when Neville Chamberlain was being particularly arrogant in the House of Commons, Lloyd George interjected

"This is our country, too". That has now been said to both parties by an electorate that refuses a mandate to either. It is difficult for party politicians to accept that directive but it need not be beyond the ability of statesmen of the most politically experienced country in the world. What the situation and the electorate call for is a national government. Its precise form must be left to the wisdom and patriotism of leadership.

* * *

HARRY LAUDER, whose death is announced was a great droll, whose success was due no less to his industry and meticulous preparation than to his natural gifts. It is said that he never sang in public a song that he had not studied and rehearsed for two years. Mr. James Bridie tells a story of a rehearsal with the orchestra in a Glasgow theatre. "That's very good boys", said Lauder, "but when I sing *ta-ta-taa,* tak' it on the upstroke of your fiddles. You get a thrrrob that way". There is a moral here for preachers as well for actors.

* * *

THE Drew lecture by the Very Rev. Dr. John Baillie on *Beliefs About The Last Things* will be printed in our July number.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL

By Sidney M. Berry, M.A., D.D.

One of the important decisions of the meetings of the International Congregational Council at Wellesley last summer was to approach the Congregational Union of England and Wales with a view to making the Congregational Quarterly an organ of international Congregationalism for the exchange of thought and information among our world-wide constituency. The Congregational Union of England and Wales welcomed the suggestion and offered its full co-operation, which was made all the easier in that the management and editorial responsibility of the Quarterly remain undisturbed by the new arrangement, which will be reviewed at the next meeting of the Council, five years hence. The present issue therefore, opens a new chapter in the history of the Quarterly.

The transition from a national to an international journal cannot be achieved in one leap, and that obvious reflection is offered to critics who may be quick to remark that the present issue of the Quarterly contains no marked changes. The task of making the necessary contacts and securing writers and correspondents is a slow one and therefore the transition is likely to be gradual and progressive.

My hope is that this widening of the Quarterly's constituency will be welcomed by its loyal supporters in our own land. The Quarterly has never been parochial in its outlook. Under the editorship of Dr. Peel and since, it has sought to bring the riches of Congregational thought from many different countries to its readers. So this new step only represents a development of the policy which the Quarterly has pursued over preceding years. But it is none the less a very definite development, and if the new policy meets with success it is hoped to present in these pages a picture of the thought and witness of the Churches in many lands. And at the same time it is our hope to build up gradually a similarly wide constituency of readers. We are apt to talk rather easily of the fellowship of churches throughout the world but in spite of National Councils of Churches linked with the World Council, the practical expressions of fellowship are all too few. It is our hope that the Quarterly may prove to be one of them, and no words are needed to emphasize the importance of such an

interchange of thought and information. In papers published by missionary societies and occasionally in the religious weeklies, we get snippets of news from the churches of other lands, but it is meagre, and in any case it is a one way traffic, for very little of the news of our churches at home or of the movement of thought among us reaches out beyond these islands. With all the talk about ecumenicity, knowledge is still parochial or, at best, national in its bounds. Even in the case of countries as closely allied as the United States and Great Britain, how little we know of each other in the life and thought of the churches! Even nearer home than that, how much do we know of the religious situation and the life of the churches in the various nations of the British Commonwealth and Empire? There is no doubt, then, about the gap to be filled.

We cannot draw any narrow boundaries round our own special constituency of churches. Congregationalism has been a colonizer from its beginnings. In more modern times, it has formed ties of union with churches of other orders. Looking at the whole wide field, I doubt whether the extent to which Congregationalists have merged with other churches is generally realized and, consequently, the comparatively small field which is occupied by churches which are purely and simply Congregational in their church order. In the case of the largest group of all, the Congregational Churches in the United States, one union was carried through some years ago which has given to those churches their present name of Congregational Christian Churches, and another movement of union is maturing with the Evangelical and Reformed Churches whose church order leans towards the Presbyterian system. The churches which have been formed as a result of the work of our missionaries, both of the L.M.S. and of the American Board of Foreign Missions, are not and could not be in the nature of things rigidly Congregational, for in churches whose membership consists of newly gathered converts from other faiths, there must of necessity be a long period of training and tutelage before they can become autonomous. In this field, too, union movements have proceeded apace, as for example, the Church of Christ in China, the Church of Christ in Japan, and the most far-reaching experiment of all, the Church of South India.

In another great country, Canada, with a future of undreamed of possibilities, the Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational Churches united, twenty-five years ago, to form the United Church of Canada, and that great experiment of Union has been singularly blessed, to the spiritual enrichment of that great Dominion.

So, even a cursory survey of this kind shows how small is the field occupied by Congregational churches after our model in this country, and in parts of the British Commonwealth like Australia,

New Zealand, and South Africa. If we were organizing an International Congregational Council to include those churches, and those churches alone, which were strictly Congregational in their order, the fellowship would be a small one indeed. But it is the declared policy of the International Council to have in its fellowship all United Churches of which Congregationalism forms a part, and all churches formed as a result of the work of missionaries sent to the foreign field by the Congregational churches. In other words, the purpose of the International Congregational Council is not to draw a hard and fast denominational boundary line and to admit into its fellowship only churches whose 'Congregational orthodoxy' is beyond question, but to keep in living touch with all churches which have a Congregational background, and to seek to stimulate and further the fundamental principles for which Congregationalism stands. If any wistful enquirer presses the question as to what those principles are (a rather belated enquiry for Congregationalists to make !) I would point them to the excellent statement which was adopted by the Conference at Wellesley.[1] At the present moment we are preparing a letter of enquiry to be sent to Congregational representatives in the mission field and in United Churches to see in what measure those principles operate in the Churches which they serve. The result of such an enquiry ought to present us with a clearer picture than at present we possess, and the purpose behind it is to make available for us all the varieties of experience as to the order of church life in widely differing conditions. It would be pharisaical to suggest that we have the whole secret ourselves. We have lessons to learn from the younger churches and the United Churches, and surely we do not mistake the spirit of Congregationalism in suggesting that no rigidity of custom will prevent us from being willing to learn. It will be a tonic to us all to cross the frontiers which separate us from our fellow Christians in other lands and to share in their experience as we want them to share in ours. No serious mind can believe that the particular forms of religious life in a country like our own are necessarily permanent. There are movements of God's Spirit among His people in other lands which may prove to be of the greatest moment for us, as the ways in which that same Spirit has guided and taught us may be of the greatest moment for them. The way to prevent any lessons being learned is to keep the barriers of ignorance standing. It is the purpose of the International Council to do something to open the roads across the frontiers and to help us all to contribute our share to the spiritual treasures of the Church Universal.

1 Proceedings of Sixth International Congregational Council pp. 38-9 and Congregational Quarterly, April 1949.

COMMON PRAYER

By Bernard Lord Manning, M.A.[1]

That unemotional and profitable divine, Jeremy Taylor, provides a warning very necessary for all who discuss prayer. "There is", he writes in paragraph 7 of Chapter iv of *The Rule of Exercises of Holy Living*, "no greater argument in the world of our spiritual danger and unwillingness to religion than the backwardness which most men have always, and all men have sometimes, to say their prayers; so weary of their length, so glad when they are done, so witty to excuse and frustrate an opportunity . . . it is a work so easy, so honourable, and to so great purpose, that in all the instances of religion and providence (except only the incarnation of His Son) God hath not given us a greater argument of His willingness to have us saved, and of our unwillingness to accept it, His goodness and our gracelessness, His infinite condescension and our carelessness and folly, than by rewarding so easy a duty with so great blessings". This warning let us steadily bear in mind as we discuss and criticize: and to it I add these words of Malachi to critics of Divine Service: "Ye said also, Behold what a weariness it is! and ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts".

One other preliminary remark I will make. Some things are not decent; and one of these at least I propose to avoid. In nothing that I have to say is there any comment or criticism based on the public prayers of the two ministers under whom I have sat for the greater part of my life and to whom I owe more than I, or they, can ever know. These ministers are, of course, Mr. Carter[2] and my father.

Now having taken these precautions and having reflected on the warnings of Jeremy Taylor and Malachi, I shall use plainness of speech; and I shall say first of all that, after attending Divine Service twice every Sunday almost all my life with a very perceptible number of weekday services thrown in, my strong impression is that our common prayer is, by a long way, the least satisfactory and the least helpful part of our services.

I take a very matter-of-fact view of Divine Service. I believe and I know that it is a duty and a good thing to attend Divine Service. I believe and I know that there is a blessing in it, that I, at least, never spend my time so well in any other way. But, in

[1] An Address given to the Cambridge University Congregational Society on 20th October, 1940, here printed by permission of his sister, Mrs. Dixon Hunter, and with the help of Principal Cunliffe-Jones who transcribed the original manuscript notes.

[2] The Rev. H. C. Carter, M.A., Minister, Emmanuel Congregational Church, Cambridge, 1910-44.

saying this, I do not mean that I always or indeed usually enjoy Divine Service or that I am conscious of getting much out of it. There is no greater nonsense or impiety than this constant concern about the way services impress or do not impress us. A well-instructed Calvinistic Churchman knows what value to set on his feelings when he approaches Mount Sinai or Mount Calvary or that mountain in Galilee where the risen Lord manifests Himself. There is a place for feeling in religion—no one baptized as I was by a Methodist has an excuse for forgetting that—but the function of feeling is not to decide whether or not it is worth while to go to church or not.

But going to church and knowing that it is a good thing to go do not mean that one loses one's senses whilst one is there. And I repeat, therefore, my strong impression that our common prayer is, by a long way, the least satisfactory and least helpful part of our services.

In most services the lessons are the best part: that is why it is such a pity that they are often the shortest part. Unless the minister is extremely ingenious and persevering the hymns cannot easily fall below a certain level and they may rise to the highest heights. The sermon is the most variable feature. The Benediction ought to be the most constant feature, and there at least we ought to be sure of a sublime and heavenly comfort. But often we get no Benediction—only a mongrel prayer. Ours is an age in which liturgical knowledge has fallen so low that the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot distinguish between the Christian Benediction, the Aaronic blessing, and the ascription of glory to God, and we cannot, I suppose, expect even our ministers to retain in such an age that elementary knowledge of what the benediction is that even Methodist local preachers had a generation ago.

Let me rehearse briefly the experiences of common prayer on which my opinions rest. First stand the prayers of our ministers in our own services in town and country and, beside these, a good many prayers of Methodist ministers in their ordinary services. To these add a large experience of the prayers of Methodist lay preachers in country services and also in country prayer meetings. That was my range when I came up as an undergraduate and I have added continuously to that sort of experience ever since. About all these I shall speak more fully later.

When I came up to Jesus I began in our matchless College Chapel to gain what has now grown to be great familiarity with the Book of Common Prayer, a product, of course, of my College. This was almost my first introduction to the Prayer Book: at school, indeed, every day began with the third Collect for grace, the Lord's Prayer and the Benediction, and I unconsciously learned to value the lawyer-like precision and the solemn rhythm of the

third Collect; but I think my only other experience of the Prayer Book was at evensong in the choir of Lincoln Cathedral: a dismal business, the prayers seemed to me there; for I was unfamiliar with the words and quite unable to catch them as apparently without any meaning for God or man they were intoned far down the choir.

But any initial prejudice Jesus Chapel decisively removed. Two of our three Deans have been exceptionally good readers and the third was an interesting reader. To the excellence of this reading I attribute my preference for the Prayer Book prayers read rather than intoned. Cambridge Anglicanism also introduced me to the use of a Bidding Prayer; and I still put up with the University sermon sometimes as the price of taking part in that most moving act of worship.

What has nearly 30 years of Anglican worship taught me about Common Prayer? It has taught me, first, what few Anglicans appear to have learnt: viz. that you must not presume to alter classical prayers. What John Wesley wrote of his brother's hymns is true of ancient prayers:

'Many gentlemen have done my brother and me (though without naming us) the honour to reprint many of our hymns. Now they are perfectly welcome to do so, provided they print them just as they are. But I desire that they would not attempt to mend them; for they really are not able. None of them is able to mend either the sense or the verse. Therefore, I must beg of them one of these two favours: either to let them stand just as they are, to take them for better for worse; or to add the true reading in the margin, and on the bottom of the page; that we may no longer be accountable either for the nonsense or for the doggerel of other men'.

I have learnt this both by positive and by negative methods: both by hearing the prayers read purely and by hearing them read with every kind of adulteration. The point of this for our purpose we shall see later on.

It has taught me, in the second place, that a liturgy of merit cannot be knocked up by writing out prayers to look about as long as collects, even if you print the initial letter in red. Nor can you concoct a litany by repeating some general remark about one line long among a series of rather longer observations. The rules by which a collect is made and its cadences secured are as definite and as difficult as the rules for making a sonnet.

It has taught me, thirdly, the value, indeed the necessity of precise articulation: it is a merit in public prayer to know what you are praying about, to say what you have to say, and when you have said it, to turn, without apology or hesitation, to something else. There is no reason why you should not call a spade a spade in prayer; and the Prayer Book usually does so.

In addition I have learnt to value two special forms of prayer already mentioned: the Bidding Prayer, i.e. directions about praying followed by a very short prayer to sum up, and the Litany. Here let me say that by the Litany I mean a long Litany that does all its praying in that form. Acquaintance with Anglicanism has emphatically not taught me to like half a dozen responses thrown higgledy-piggledy into a form of prayer constructed for the most part on other lines. But ten minutes or a quarter of an hour wholly devoted to a long litany covering a great field of intercession—that is another and a vastly better thing. And no form of prayer helps me more.

Yet, with all my admiration of the Prayer Book, I always felt, and still feel, that Matins and Evensong are not wholly satisfactory forms of prayer for an ordinary congregation. That, I think, is shown by the Anglican drift away from Matins to Sung Eucharist; and by contrasting the crowded congregations in Chapel in 1912 and the handful in pre-war days.

One last thing Anglican worship has taught me: the folly of Dissenters who now become Anglicans. If our forefathers left Anglicanism when it had at least the merit of using the Prayer Book and not playing the fool with it, there can be no case for our joining Anglicanism just as it is ceasing to respect its own greatest possession.

To one other kind of prayer Cambridge brought me: the prayer that was used in those days in the Student Christian Movement. This had two main types, the spoken and the silent, and I do not know which I disliked the more: the silent, I think, because it gave one time to comprehend how deeply one hated it. The S.C.M. did much for me, but in the matter of prayer I owe it nothing. The convention of unconventionality, the attempt to be piquant, the bringing of prayer so much into ordinary life that it spoke the language of ordinary life: this—and I claim no merit for my feeling—made me want to curl up to hide my mental blushing. I disliked even more the silent prayer period in which I could only wonder how long the silence would last.

Finally I must mention what were almost the only public prayers that, for a certainty, added greatly to the service: prayers on which I came to count as I counted on the lesson and the hymns and the sermon. These were the prayers of Dr. Hubert Simpson at Westminster Chapel. They had no spectacular wording or idiosyncracy: they were simple and noble: and they made one pray.

Coming back to our ordinary services after this scrambling experience, what strikes us about the prayers that we usually hear? Why are they often the least helpful part of the service? Well, in the first place, I think they are too long. It may be that

I have developed a complex on the subject; I still feel something of the horror with which the Long Prayer always affected me when I was a boy. Everywhere it was the same. There appeared to be no chance that it would ever end. You simply resigned yourself. Time after time occurred places at which an admirable ending could have been made; but No. 'Pray without ceasing': that apostolic word had been only too carefully observed. I watched the sunbeam broken in the windows and caught in the gilt of the hymn book covers; I played every kind of game and then, at last, it was over: and we raised our heads, it seemed to me, like people coming out of their huts after a tornado anxious to see who is still there and who is missing.

One reason, I believe, for my liking for sermons was the simple one that when the sermon came, the Long Prayer was over. That shadow that dimly menaced all the earlier part of the service and in particular ruined the lessons for me, that was over. Whatever was enjoyable in what followed was a mercy without repentance.

To this old feeling of escape I attribute the cold fury into which I usually sink when an unexpected prayer follows the sermon or precedes the benediction. But of that I will speak later.

These feelings I hope no one else shares, and I try to discount them in what follows. But I suspect that they have some bearing on the decline in church attendance.

Too long; and (this is the second point) too woolly: too wordy: too voluble. They are not often enough what Jeremy Taylor says prayers should be—intense, solemn, and affectionate. That is easily said: but why? Here let me speak from the pulpit as a lay preacher who has tried for a quarter of a century and failed utterly[3]. If my criticism is sharp, be sure that I know it is turned against myself.

Consider the immense difficulty of extempore prayer when you represent a congregation. There are all the usual difficulties of extempore speech in an exaggerated form. What is the main difficulty of extempore speech once a man has got over the initial fear of standing on his hind legs and talking? It is the tendency to diffuseness. You feel comfortable and you grow callous about your hearers. You do not realize the flabbiness of what you say.

Consider what we try to do in extempore prayer. In the Prayer Book Matins and Evensong, the prayers deal mainly with three things, Confession, Thanksgiving, Intercession. We accept these and often add Adoration and Dedication, aspects of worship dealt with in Matins and Evensong by Psalms and Canticles. This is an immense field to cover in two prayers.

[3] Those who heard Manning preach or have read his two volumes of sermons, *A Layman in the Ministry* and *More Sermons of a Layman* (both Independent Press) will not accept this harsh self-judgment.—*Ed.*

Consider, again, that in Common Prayer he who speaks to God on behalf of the congregation must carry the congregation with him. What he says they must follow; they must understand; it must be their prayer as well as his, or Protestantism is abandoned, there is no Common Prayer, and we are back with a priest saying one prayer while people say or do not say their own. So far as I can see, there are several ways in which we can be sure that the prayer is *common* in this sense.

It may follow a simple well-known set form as in the Prayer Book: everyone knows what is coming and it is his own fault if he does not pray it. Or there is the manner of the Gallican liturgy; by this, the congregation is first invited to pray in a particular way about a particular object; and then, in practically the same words, the invitation is turned round and a prayer made of it. That is to say, the congregation is warned every time. This can be moving, but it is cumbrous. Then there is the way of the extempore speaker. He must elaborate as he passes from point to point. There is no fixed liturgy: this is a prayer for the King: this is a thanksgiving for the Incarnation. He has to use a good many words to make his transitions clear. Do you wonder that such prayer is not intense or solemn?

Do not think that we who pray in public are unaware of all these difficulties. Of one we are sometimes too conscious: the easiness with which we drop into a stereotyped form of words: the danger of tedium as we offer confession, thanksgiving, adoration, intercession, twice every Sunday. How to relieve that? Well, it is as a relief from the tedium of a fixed liturgy that free prayer is commended. It can be more personal. Alas, it can: and being more personal so often means being egotistical. It becomes the minister's prayer, not the people's prayer. The minister thinks aloud his thoughts to God: but beautiful and moving as these may be, they are not Common Prayer: any more than thinking aloud makes a good speech or a good sermon. And the moment the leader of free prayer tries consciously to avoid tedium, he is lost. He has his eye on two sorts of hearer: God and the congregation: and so we get sundry kinds of horrors: the prayer of piquant, original language: the psychological prayers in which the minister tries to make confession real by turning our souls inside out with such psychological skill or clumsiness as he can command; or to make thanksgiving or intercession real by prayers that remind one of a Telephone Directory, an inventory, or the Bazaar Exchange and Mart. You know what I mean: we are made to give thanks for crocuses and for eclipses of the moon, for T. S. Eliot, and for the T.U.C. We are made to intercede for taxi drivers and veterinary surgeons, for people who write serial stories and the man who takes your money at Madame Tussaud's. I was horrified to

find Dr. John Watson in *The Cure of Souls* lending his authority to this kind of catalogue.

I said that the man who, as he prays, tries consciously to avoid tedium is lost: he is lost because he has an eye on his congregation as he prays; and once he looks at them he is lucky if he does not drift into that most desperate sort of prayer described in the classical phrase of the old woman who said that the minister gave the good Lord a deal of information. Information is at times given tendentiously, as in the prayer of the man who referred to the unloosing of Satan and then besought that Satan might speedily return to that place of captivity "from which as Thou, O Lord, knowest very well, he ought never to have been allowed to escape". The information is, of course, meant for the congregation. It often amounts to advice or rebuke offered in an indirect way. A certain guest, who had the reputation for outstaying his welcome, was invited to join in family prayers, and he heard included among the intercessions a petition for "travelling mercies for our friend who leaves us by the 10 o'clock train tomorrow".

My objection to prayers after the sermon is not entirely petulant. It is an irrational expression of a rational dislike of a prayer that is an address to the congregation. Such prayers are usually too obvious an attempt to drive the lesson home, and sometimes merely record the drab fact that we know we have failed to make it properly in the sermon. How far this misuse of prayer can go is illustrated by a remark made to my sister after a wedding "What a nice address the minister gave". He had given no address, as a post-mortem of the service revealed, but had disguised one as a prayer.

The classical condemnation of free prayer — the American reporter's account of one as the most eloquent prayer offered to a Boston congregation—is not yet out of date.

Even the information which consists of an essay on the attributes of God, or a description of His ways with His people, is wrongly given to the congregation in prayer. Yet the prayer of adoration often drifts into this form. Here the Prayer Book can teach us much. The attributes of God most appropriate to the intercession that follows are mentioned briefly, but there is no lengthy disquisition. Thus, "Blessed Lord who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning" is the natural prelude to a prayer about the right use of Scripture: as "O God Who alone workest great marvels" is the appropriate introduction to a prayer that bishops and episcopally ordained clergy may receive the Holy Ghost.

You will justly charge me with merely unhelpful snarking unless I alter my method. What positive suggestion can be made about overcoming the inherent difficulties of free prayer? Take first this difficulty of avoiding tedium and holding attention and not being

too long. Is it necessary to be long if we are to cover all the ground and to make clear to a congregation, ignorant of our intention when we begin, where we are going? Is it necessary to be precious or vulgar or extravagant to avoid tedium? If so, is it not necessary, in order to have dignified prayer in reasonable compass, to return to fixed prayers? To all of which questions, the answer is *No*.

Consider first the *matter* proper to put into our prayers. Part of our difficulty arises from the simple fact that we try to make our prayers do too much. As I have said, we crush into them not only all that the Anglican prayers do, but also things done in other parts of the liturgy, adoration and dedication, and worship of the attributes of God. We do this because we do not use our own liturgy as intelligently as we might. I mean, of course, our chants and hymns, and, I would add, our lessons. If we make our congregations do specific acts of worship as they sing, and understand what they are about, they will not require to do precisely the same thing the next minute in a prayer: indeed they will require us not to do so. Teach a congregation to notice intelligently what a hymn does. If it gives general praise like *"Now thank we all our God"*, or confession like *"Stay Thou insulted Spirit"*, or an act of adoration and dedication like *"When I survey the Wondrous Cross"*, it is not only unnecessary, it is almost a blasphemous suggestion that the hymn was saying it frivolously and without meaning, to do it all over again, even though we preface our prayer with the tell-tale apologetic phrase "as we have just been singing".

What is the value of our much boasted freedom if we are not free to direct the mind of a congregation before it sings a hymn? Nothing is more proper before an intercessory prayer than a meditation on the office of Christ as our Eternal High Priest, pleading His merits as He intercedes for us; that is done for us in *"Where high the heavenly Temple stands"*. And if we invite the congregation to sing it consciously as a preface to prayer, there is no need to do it again. "Before we offer our intercession to Almighty God, let us remember the continual intercession made for us by our merciful High Priest as we sing to His praise hymn . . .". In a similar way, the prayer that we may not hear the Word read or preached in vain may be offered by such a hymn as *"Come Holy Ghost"*. Crowds of other examples come to mind: we have hymns of intercession—for various classes of men, for the Church, for the nation. If these are sung with reference to the spoken prayer, time is saved, which is what we began by seeking; but more than that, the service is enriched as it gains in unity and in making people aware of what they are about. In fact, our liturgy is put into action. We cannot always allow the two lessons to bear on one another. One is then free for supplying meditation on the attributes of God, or intercession, or confession.

So acting, we provide the answer to that silliest of all superficial criticisms of our services, namely, that compared with the Anglican, they give the congregation too small a share. Four hymns—long hymns, no verses omitted—and a chant, if made a true part of the service and not an irrelevant set of intervals, give a congregation far more to do than an Anglican congregation has. I, at least, will not exchange them for permission to make six responses in the lesser litany and . . . Amens, even though I am allowed to sing *"Praise my soul the King of Heaven"* and one other bad hymn as well. Having thus reduced the matter of our prayers by excluding all remarks of a merely informative or edifying type, and by letting our sung prayers in hymns count for something, we are left with a problem much more easy to compass.

What, then, are we to say now of the manner of prayer? How are we to get rid of the 'woolliness', the wordiness, the tedium, the irreverence of that quick flow of easy familiar platitude that often takes the place of prayer?

First, we must say much less. We must go slower, and we must spend less time. A prayer slowly said is for me infinitely better than a rapid prayer and a vacuum of silence. The demand for silent prayer is, I believe, an over-corrective of our usual volubility: but an over-corrective is itself an evil.

Then, if we pray for things which the congregation truly needs, it will not find the prayer tedious: if it needs the same thing week after week, the repetition is not tedious. Which brings us to this: in order to pray truly on behalf of the congregation so as to make them pray and not merely to be bored, the minister must know them. He must know something of the life and mind of the charwoman, the prosperous butcher, the dyspeptic don, the socially ambitious widow, the fashion-plate girl of 18. Unless he knows these people, how can he pray on their behalf—not merely for them? But if he knows them, he will pray about things that concern them and interest them, though not in language that they would use. Incidentally, they neither expect nor respect that. We are not, then, to pray at large, but on behalf of a particular congregation known to us, or sufficiently like one known to us to make our prayer real.

We deal, then, in our spoken prayers with different subjects each service, according to our hymns. And inside this changing programme, if I may so call it, we can secure variety and freshness by that use of those several methods at which we have glanced. Objects of the intercession can be named in a sort of bidding prayer and the blessing asked in a very brief petition at the end—this is a helpful alternative to reciting the objects as we pray; and if the words used at the end are general and familiar—a familiar collect or the Lord's Prayer—so much the better. One of the most moving

forms of prayer is to use familiar words with a special, precise intention. The use of the petition, *Give us this day our daily bread,* just before the moment of Communion is the classical example. (That perhaps is why so many of our service books place it just after Communion). But, of course, the intention with which the prayer is to be said, the special meaning to be understood in its words, must be made clear to the congregation. This, I am persuaded, is a form of prayer that we can use to great advantage.

About language, I have two things to say.

(1) We cannot have language too direct or constructions too simple: long sentences with complicated constructions, even if grammatical, do not hold attention. Slack and semi-slack people do not attend to a continuous stream of sound. The Prayer Book in this provides many models. It teaches us to pray for "George, our most gracious King and Governor: grant him in health and wealth long to live: giving him the victory over all his enemies".

Contrast this with the more generalized vaguer language which we often use. There is far more chance of natural variety, by the way, if one is direct and specific. The generalized vague prayer is always much the same—the lowest common denominator of intercession, which avoids asking for the wrong thing in private or in public. I believe that God wants sincere intercession, beyond the reach of logical and moral criticism. I have not the least scruple about putting before God my wishes concerning weather, war, examinations, and, in so far as I know the congregation, I have no hesitation in offering public prayers on similar lines.

There are some prayers that we should use with the whole Catholic Church; but I think it false doctrine that we should pray only such prayers in public as any Christian can join in. There is a place for the specialized local prayer, and one of the merits of free prayer is that it provides this as no fixed liturgy can. Direct, specific, plain language then; that is one rule.

(2) The second thing about language is this. As I hear unlearned country people pray in public, I notice, of course, that many of them pray almost the same prayers on every occasion: but I notice another thing, that their prayers are intense, solemn, affectionate. They have a dignity and a passion which is surprising when you contrast them with the prayers of better educated people. Now do not tell me that this is because they are better men. It is not; some of them are not better men; some of them are not at all specially good men. That highfalutin spirituality which explains everything by a reference to character is mere laziness. No: there is what I may call a technical reason. Their language is scriptural. Their prayers are packed with phrases of Scripture, quotations of Scripture phrases and with long passages used with a particular intention. They are better men than the better educated

people with whom I have contrasted them, not in character, but in familiarity with Holy Scripture. They know it better, and they know it extensively, for they have few other literary standards except the Westmorland Herald or the Wiltshire Times. Now here, I suggest, is the second thing we can do to the language of public prayers. We can make them more Scriptural. This is not formalism, for when you know the Scripture phrase you find it expresses your meaning more freshly than your own. The Psalms, Deuteronomy, parts of the Historical Books; the Prophets, the Epistles, the Apocalypse, the Apocrypha, are crammed with phrases of most moving language of adoration, confession, intercession, and dedication. To move familiarly in this language is to move where public prayer will lose the thinness, the platitudinousness, the poverty that so often degrades it.

But note, it is the exact language of Holy Scripture that we need. Nearly 30 years of the Prayer Book and the Authorized Version have taught me that. Inaccurate citation of the classics, the Bible or the Prayer Book, is a public monument to our laziness, infuriating to those who do know the Bible and the Prayer Book.

"The words of my lips and the meditation of my heart" are to be "acceptable in Thy sight" not "to come up with acceptance before Thee". This doctrine, of course, condemns at a blow all those bowdlerizations of the Prayer Book which make so many of our service books despicable beyond any description of mine. To take the noble opening of the Prayer of Humble Access: 'We do not presume to come to this Thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table. But Thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy: Grant us therefore, gracious Lord . . .'—and then to tail off into less poignant words about being filled with His spirit, is to rouse the devil of anger and contempt in the heart of any person educated in the Prayer Book. Similarly, all tinkerings with the Benediction: making the peace of God garrison our hearts: giving us extension in time and space of the Benediction: most hideous of all, the use of novel, fantastic words at the administration of the Elements—even if the new words were not always banal to a point that is near blasphemy—this would be as intolerable as it is common.

We can, then, improve the language of our prayers by saying a great part of what we have to say in the very words of Scripture. There is little need for repetition; and it is a revival of Puritan practice.

This means, of course, that a great many of our prayers must be written. I make no bones about that. There is far more freedom in using a prayer specially written than in trying to remember the

outline of the prayer that you have planned; and with the written notes before you, you break freely into extempore prayer more easily, for you have secured the spirit of prayer in which free prayer is possible.

One incidental result this use of Scriptural language has. It teaches us the advantage of frequent naming of the Name of God; the use of the many Names by which His attributes are set out. And here the practice of the rustic local preacher coincides with the advice of the fastidious Non-Juror. Let me give you the passage from Wm. Law's *Serious Call,* chap. xiv, which settled that matter once for all for me.

"When you begin your petitions, use such various expressions of the attributes of God as may make you most sensible of the greatness and power of the Divine Nature. Begin, therefore, in words like these: O Being of all beings, Fountain of all light and glory, gracious Father of men and Angels, whose universal Spirit is everywhere present, giving life and light, and joy, to all Angels in Heaven, and all creatures upon earth. . . . For these representations of Divine attributes, which show us in some degree the Majesty and greatness of God, are an excellent means of raising our hearts into lively acts of worship and adoration. What is the reason that most people are so much affected with this petition in the Burial Service of our Church: Yet, O Lord God most holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and most merciful Saviour, deliver us not unto the bitter pains of eternal death? It is, because the coming together of so many great expressions gives such a description of the greatness of the Divine Majesty, as naturally affects every sensible mind. Although, therefore, prayer does not consist in fine words or studied expressions; yet as words speak to the soul, as they have a certain power of raising thoughts in the soul; so those words which speak of God in the highest manner, which most fully express the power and presence of God, which raise thoughts in the soul most suitable to the greatness and providence of God, are the most useful and most edifying in our prayers".

Law also adds a paragraph on such a use of Scripture as I have described, "When at any time, either in reading the Scripture or any book of piety, you meet with a passage that more than ordinarily affects your mind, and seems, as it were, to give your heart a new motion towards God, you should try to turn it into the form of a petition and then give it a place in your prayers. By this means you will be often improving your prayers, and storing yourself with proper forms of making the desires of your heart known unto God".

What I have already said makes it unnecessary to say much about the recent crop of Service Books. It is not to them that I look for much improvement in our public prayers. For one thing, even

if you grant that the object they aim at is good, they are deplorably ineffective for attaining it. I can illustrate the stage of the liturgical knowledge of the editors by a reference to the revival of Gothic architecture. When the early 19th century began to be interested in Gothic architecture, it thought it could build Gothic churches, by devising Gothic windows, Gothic columns, Gothic ornaments. In most industrial towns you find odd structures, classical 18th century churches in ground plan, roof pitch and in layout, but ornamented with (say) 15th century Perpendicular windows and Norman archways. Later, our authorities learnt that to build a Gothic church you begin, not with ornamental detail but with the understanding of the function of the several parts of the building; the skeleton must be right before you add the whiskers or the painted nails. Early 19th century Gothic, e.g. St. Andrew the Great, is like the fur of a cat fitted over the skeleton of a cod fish.

Heaven knows we need to study liturgy: but that is not to write bad parodies of the Prayer Book, but to learn what the several parts of public worship are and the several ways in which they can be performed. Get the framework right, then you can put free or fixed prayer inside it.

So far from teaching anything correct, these books abound in every illustration of bogus collects, and the most elementary confusion of ascription and benediction: whilst the sentences which they propose for constant use in place of those venerable by centuries of familiarity make one sick at one hearing, and sicker at every repetition.

Yes, someone will say, all this fuss about preparation of prayers is a mistake. All we want is a baptism of the Holy Ghost. If a man's heart is right, his prayer will reach God and be a blessing to a congregation. If the congregation is not blessed, it is because it is supercilious, spiritually dead, like the writer of this paper. Against which doctrine I protest. It is not enough to be a good man and to have your heart in the right place. We have all suffered unnecessarily and irretrievably from such men. The truth is that in prayer, as in drawing according to Ruskin, there are three stages. In the first, the work is unconsciously done, and a genius gets beautiful results by the light of nature. But that cannot last, and only a genius can ever get them. In the second stage, he gets self-conscious: he begins to think about what he is doing and then he begins to study. The result is not pleasing: it seems to be a declension; it is full of mannerism and stiffness; but more study, not less, is the remedy. Then issues the third stage, when knowledge is so familiar and so well controlled that the first freedom returns with a new power.

THE REVEREND DR.H.ELVET LEWIS,C.H.[1]

By William Evans, B.A. (Wil Ifan)

Whereas the Anniversary poster outside a church in England informs us that the preacher will be the Rev. Dr. H. Elvet Lewis, C.H., M.A., in front of a Welsh chapel we read the single word Elfed. Both are one and the same person; and yet not quite. Wales's use of the one word must not be taken as a sign of easy-going familiarity or of popularity even: 'Elfed' is his official Bardic title and its familiar use suggests that whatever heights the preacher may have reached in scholarship and oratory, to the Welshman he is first and foremost a poet who has sung noble lyrics and great hymns.

But why are 'Elfed' and 'Elvet' spelt differently? To begin with, an Englishman could not be expected to know that a single "f" in Welsh carries the "v" sound and he might well imagine that "Elfed" had something to do with "Elf". But having changed the "f" into "v", the new name "Elved" might have been mis-pronounced to rhyme with "shelved", and that would never do, for though he be ninety years old no-one has thought of providing a shelf for him! And that is how the compromise-name Elvet was coined. And even in the pulpit Elvet is not quite Elfed. He himself knows that the English language does not lend itself to that melodious intoning which is part and parcel of his Welsh preaching. He can translate his thoughts and his metaphors but very wisely he does not try to translate that; and this is why, however much he may enjoy listening to Dr. Elvet Lewis, no Englishman has ever heard Elfed preaching.

Howell Lewis, for that was his baptismal name, was born in the romantic, wooded glen of Cynwyl Elfed in Carmarthenshire, and as a mere boy he was sent to the school of the prophets at nearby Newcastle Emlyn and thence to the Presbyterian College at Carmarthen. He was already making a name for himself, quite literally, for those interested in Welsh verse were forgetting the "Howell" and speaking of "Elfed"; and it was no little surprise to his admirers when they heard that the gifted writer of Welsh had accepted a call to the English church at Buckley. Strangely enough it was the English pulpit that claimed him for many years, at Llanelly, in far away Hull, and in London. But at last the Welsh people at King's Cross, London, claimed their own and it was there and from there that he exercised a great ministry: *from* there, for the good London Welsh exiles willingly shared

1 Dr. Elvet Lewis celebrates his 90th birthday on the 14th April.

their Elfed with the home country and gladly allowed him time and again to step up to the booking office at Paddington, only insisting that it always had to be a return ticket.

The Welsh congregations that flock to hear Elfed do not come expecting to hear the mighty eloquence of a Herber Evans and his like—if indeed it is proper to use the phrase 'and his like' after Herber's name: they fill the chapel well knowing that there await them treasures new and old: they come prepared for words that are choice and for Bible pictures that are vivid and unforgettable. They would be rather shocked if he attempted the dramatic shout that is still part and parcel of much of the typical anniversary preaching of Wales. They want the gospel, set to music.

For all the years Dr. Lewis has maintained an intimate touch with every congregation that he addresses. In his ordinary social intercourse, though he is eminently friendly and courteous, no one cares to make free with him: and by this time, of course, his great age and his many distinctions have only tended to deepen one's sense of reverent awe in his presence. No one pushes up very near to him, and he himself does not seem to open out even to his intimates.

Would it be right to say that Elfed's real friend is his congregation? There he withholds nothing; he opens his very heart; he speaks to us and for us. Indeed I know of no one with a deeper 'congregational' sense. That is partly why he writes great hymns: they are individualistic only in the sense that a congregation can be regarded as an individual. His friend is the congregation be it large or small, and through the years he has been the congregation's good friend.

A new preaching test faced Dr. Lewis with the advent of the radio, but he soon proved himself to be the very best religious broadcaster in Wales. I almost said that he learnt to close his eyes so that he could see the numberless crowd that was now listening to him: but today, unfortunately, Dr. Lewis is blind, so that without any effort of will he conjures up his wireless congregation just as he does his Sunday to Sunday congregations. And thus there is no difference in his style or in his mood.

When we remember his handicap of blindness we cannot but marvel at the timing of his wireless addresses. And sometimes the circumstances call for something greater even than this almost exact sense of the passage of time. Mr. Hopkin Morris, an old member of King's Cross, told me that when he was at the head of the Welsh Region he was very eager to secure a record of Elfed's voice for the generations to come and the preacher accepted his invitation to the studio at Cardiff. "Would you be good enough to talk about your hymns for a quarter of an hour?" "No, not about my own hymns, but I shall speak on Welsh hymns in

general". And soon Elfed had settled down to talk as happily as if he were addressing a little company of people in a Bethel vestry, and by some uncanny instinct, as ever, he finished almost to the second. Elfed himself was quite satisfied: he had enjoyed talking and he had been much moved by thus meditating aloud about his favourite Welsh hymns, but when he was getting up to make for the door a word came over the wire from Bristol where the actual recording was being made—"We are extremely sorry: everything was perfect on the Cardiff side, but something has gone wrong with the recording here at Bristol". It was difficult for Mr. Morris to break the awkward news to Elfed, but when he begged him to come to the studio again at some later date, the unperturbed preacher heard it all with complete placidity and asked why it was necessary to come at some later date:—"If they are ready at Bristol, let me say it once again". And he said it once again with exactly the same genuinely happy conviction and enthusiasm.

It was typical of Elfed that he should have refused to speak of his own hymns, but English and Welsh churches of many denominations have cause to thank one who has given voice, and a singing voice, to what is in their soul. His hymn, written in the first place for a Colonial Missionary Service, has become the International Anthem of the Church:—

Whom oceans part, O Lord, unite
To love Thy name and seek Thy light;
Though from each other far we be,
Let none, O Christ, be far from Thee.

It would be difficult to single out any one Welsh hymn when he has written scores that bring a rich blessing whenever they are sung.

This note would be incomplete if it did not stress Elfed's place in the Welsh National Eisteddfod, and I can do no better than attempt to picture one actual incident, so typical of many that have occurred along the years. It was at a very recent gathering when I was privileged to be the man in charge of the Bardic proceedings. The successful bard had just been chaired with much pomp and ceremony: on this occasion he was a young man scoring his first national success. Excitement ran high and it became my duty to make sure that the next step did not plunge us into anti-climax. I knew I was on safe ground when I announced quietly "And now after chairing one young man, I call upon another young man to address you." As I spoke the words I stepped back to where the white-robed druids sat and escorted one of their number to the front of the stage: and when the crowd saw that I was *leading him by the hand* they realized that my 'young man' was none other than the blind poet Elfed, nearer 90 than 80: and their

enthusiasm knew no bounds. While the cheering was still at its height I had time to place him right in front of the microphone—"There you are, Elfed, you are in the exact position now". But Elfed, the old broadcaster, is not the man to accept a mere arch-druid's assurance, and not until he had touched the microphone with his own slender, sensitive fingers did he satisfy himself that he was at the correct distance, and then in the expectant silence, came that young, flowing, resonant voice, like the first rich notes of a baritone solo:—*"Annwyl Gyd-wladwyr!"* "Dear Fellow-Countrymen!" He began by referring to his first Eisteddfod, held some 65 years back, and how the crowd enjoyed his little aside—"I am not sure that you were all present at that Eisteddfod!" But Elfed was there, and ever since those early festivals he has been one of the leading figures, and one who will always be ranked among the greatest of our arch-druids. He is ever equal to the occasion. At the Swansea National Eisteddfod our present King and Queen were about to be received into the Mystic Circle. When they approached for their initiation we wondered how Elfed would receive them. Under the circumstances a merely formal bow would be quite inadequate, while a handshake of course would savour too much of familiarity. We need not have been anxious! Elfed, as if it had been the traditional custom from time immemorial, stretched out his left hand, palm upward: the Queen placed her right hand on it and then he solemnly, almost ritually, covered her hand with his own right hand and uttered the words of initiation. And then the same exact procedure, carried out with grace and dignity, followed in the case of the King.

Elfed has since then been raised by His Majesty at Buckingham Palace to the proud position of 'Companion of Honour', but though not flurried in the presence of Royalty, the common people, the rank and file, are his people. Even after the excitement of the chairing of the young bard on that occasion how easily did he hold the crowd in the hollow of his hand: "I am greeting the young poet who has won his first Bardic Chair: let it be to him an incentive to further labour: for the only danger in being presented with a chair is that a poet may be tempted to *sit* in it! I greet you, too, the gallant losers: did I say 'losers'? But nobody loses who has truly tried: for the effort is in itself rewarding: there may not always be a prize for endeavour, but there is a prize *in* every honest endeavour."

He only spoke for ten minutes and when his cadenced intonation warned the multitude that his speech was almost over they were eager for him to continue. But he had said what he wanted to say and he remained standing there for one brief moment to acknowledge the thunder of their applause: and then I led him back

again: back to his own humble seat; the blind seer, the sweet singer of Wales.

It is good to remember that the country has not withheld its appreciation and due recognition of the many services rendered by Dr. Lewis. His own denomination, both in Wales and England, and the Council of the Free Churches have bestowed their highest honours. The Welsh University has loaded his shoulders with many hoods. The Church sings his hymns. The Eisteddfod acknowledges his worth. The King has publicly proclaimed that he is what we always knew him to be, a Companion of Honour.

Indeed if any man ought to be satisfied with his meed of enthusiastic recognition that man is the Rev. Dr. H. Elvet Lewis, C.H., and yet . . .

However great Elvet may be in these spheres where he has won recognition I have long felt that there is one field that has been almost entirely forgotten, and his prowess in that field, too, is remarkable. I refer to his English poems on general subjects. It seems to me that after contentedly preaching and singing to a mixed company in a chapel and in an Eisteddfod pavilion, Elfed has occasionally wistfully visualized another audience, a more select company of disciplined literary artists. And to them he has ventured to say some things, at once subtle and elemental, that would possibly be lost upon a crowd, who have long counted on a mellifluous 'hwyl' in diction and sound orthodoxy in matter. And here, though he has not perhaps quite freed himself from the occasional hymn-book phrase, he is yet another Elvet: more daring in his imagery, and more in line generally with the acknowledged masters. Very few people remember that he has published two volumes of such English verse, and it is quite possible that these slim volumes contain his most authentic work, work that will stand the test[2].

Even here his themes are inevitably those that have exercised his mind during the long course of his ministry and the background of his imagery is often Biblical, but now he can afford to give free rein to his fancy: he can afford to introduce the phrase that would certainly be out of place in any hymn-book. I have room to refer to two poems only from his collection entitled "Israel and Other Poems". The title-poem "Israel" contains nine short sections.

Here is the Jew who has drawn the prophet's mantle over his priestly robes:—

> He had leaned on the edge of time,
> And the chant of eternity caught;
> And he was forgiven the crime
> Of thinking aloud God's thought.

2 Israel and Other Poems (Foyle, 1930), Songs of Assisi (Aberystwyth Press, 1938).

He armed himself for his wars
With a soul more keen than his sword;
He impressed the impartial stars
To fight on his side for the Lord.

He contrasts the tragic end of the Jewish clash with Rome with the victory of a young Jew who was crucified:—

He struck at the Caesars and fell;
Like a leaf he was driven and whirled
In a gust of the winds of hell—
While his Nazarene took the world.

And yet, outlawed and hounded, there is an enduring something that we have to reckon with:—

From Ghetto to Devil's Isle
Is the trail of an infinite crime.
Have care! Though he suffer awhile
He is not on bad terms with Time!

* * * *

With the ache of the primal hills,
He is stung, in his Whitechapel den.
A glimpse of the ladder thrills
His soul, 'mid the scowls of men.

Has Israel been largely destroyed by the greed of his own hand, fingering "the continent's gold—
With a curse at his heel"?

Even so, a note of hope can be struck—

From Zion shall yet go forth
The kindlier, larger law;
The South shall join hands with the North,
And soul unto soul shall draw.

The second work is more personal and intimate. Reading the first line we have the theme of the whole poem:—

I shall make my long, last journey one of these casual days.

It is that unexpected "casual" that adds to the poignancy of it all. The traveller is bound on the most fateful of all journeys, yet all will go on as if nothing had happened:—

I shall make my long, last journey one of these casual days,
And the sun will bring the morning and the world will go its ways;
I will go in silence; threading my way in the outer dark
Alone: with never a path, or any familiar mark;
A stranger and a pilgrim in the valley of lost routes,
Where a brother has no brother, and there are no salutes!

Do I crave a definite token, with authentic signature?
Ah, yes, at times! Why deny it were sweet, at times to make sure?
—But proof? The proof is nowhere. Or else it is everywhere:—
A hint, a recurrent echo, a feeling in the air.

You have doubts? So have I, my brother. But doubt will not
take us far;
Doubt may have quenched a marsh-flame, but it never lit a star.
I will trust my faith, yea, trust it unto the uttermost due;
Soon enough for the forfeit, should a numbness chill me through!

Sometimes, in sleepless watches, a horror, mute, will arise.
A sense of fog and of flood weighs down the avoiding eyes.
. . . But yet, when was fog so shapeless but there was still a beyond?
Or a flood where the doves all perished, bringing the new
world's frond.

Should a man go hugging the worst, and hang the best for a lie?
What tho' my night be starless? There are stars about in the sky.
In the dumb void of the blackness, when my strength the
dumbness saps,
There comes to me, e'en at the lowest, an audible perhaps.

Say what we will, we are rocked by a tide of eternities.
Life will not be made little, tho' we should live it amiss;
Its failure lisps of its greatness—as, in the drouth of June,
A brook will hide its flowing, but cannot hush its tune.

I shall make my long last journey one of these casual days,
And the sun will bring the morning, and the world will go its ways.
No, I spy no pillared gateway, no evident casement light;
Only a dim sense of dawn in the bleak outgoings of night.
I want no ghosts sent forward, to curse me upon that shore,
When I loose the bark from its moorings, and take the single oar!

PATTERNS IN SCRIPTURE

By James Stewart, M.A., B.D.

Much work is now being done in the field of Scriptural interpretation, the object of the scholars who are engaging in it being to state, or to re-state, the nature and purpose of the Bible and to explain how it should be approached and understood. In this department there is a certain movement of thought which, if only because of the intellectual stature of its advocates, demands consideration. The wide spread of its influence also gives it a claim to our attention, for its exponents include scholars of the most diverse ecclesiastical traditions, and probably few students now remain unaffected by its appeal. A short study of its main characteristics may therefore be not out of place.

A common apologetic starting-point is found in criticism of the Liberalism which marked nineteenth century Protestant scholarship for its own. Professor T. W. Manson has provided a good send-off in the title and substance of his essay: 'The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God'.[1] His contention there is that Liberal scholars approached the Bible with the wrong presuppositions in their minds. They believed that certain ideas, some bequeathed by Kant and his successors and others supplied by contemporary physical science, were true beyond all question, and they were induced by their belief to find in Scripture just what illustrated or accorded with these ideas. But these ideas were not trustworthy. They were 'at variance with the fundamental ideas of the Bible'[2] by which alone Scripture should be interpreted and which alone will show forth its truth. Christianity has its own 'dogmatic presuppositions',[3] presumably given by the Bible itself: they are the only key to the Scriptures.

Professor C. H. Dodd also maintains this position. He says, for example, that Liberal scholars took from the theory of biological evolution a presupposition about the nature of history which 'has often given a distorting bias'[4] to their work, while on the other hand 'they did less than justice to the fact that the Bible has its own doctrine about the nature of history'.[5]

The same diagnosis of the Liberal sickness is made by Father Hebert, who also prescribes the same medicine—though perhaps

1 In volume *The Interpretation of the Bible* ed. Dugmore.
2 T. W. Manson, *op. cit.* p. 102.
3 cf. *op. cit.* p. 102.
4 *The Bible Today* p. 26. cf. J.T.S. vol. xlvi, No 183-4, p. 208.
5 *The Bible Today* p. 26.

his mixture is a little stronger than before. He quotes Dr. Manson with approval, deplores all attempts to interpret the Bible by 'categories alien to itself'[6] and suggests that with the collapse of Liberalism 'a right answer to the problem of the Bible becomes possible, since the Biblical view of life can now more readily be taken at its own valuation'.[7]

The positive task of the 'post-Liberal' critic is therefore the setting out of the categories and ideas which are native to the Bible. Scripture is to be helped to speak for itself. We must give it the authority it claims for itself, and we must express its truths in terms of itself as a unity which is the declared Word of God. That task is being carried out. In its performance some divergences are inevitable; nevertheless, a considerable amount of agreement is achieved.

Some notion of what is agreed, and of the way in which many now look on the Bible, is to be reached through a consideration of a term which has recently climbed out of the verbal commonalty to a position of some eminence. This is the word 'pattern'.

The word appears often, and with significance, in recent writings. It is the key to the understanding of the events and the written record of Israel's history. Fr. Hebert writes that 'Jeremiah spoke of a new Exodus . . . from Babylon and the other lands of the exile. The importance of this promise is that it marks the beginning of the "spiritual" or "mystical" interpretation of the story of the first Exodus, as giving the pattern of a new and greater Deliverance'.[8] This view of national history and Scripture is held to be shared by Jeremiah's successors both in the Old Testament and in the New. More, they saw the same thing in individual lives. Speaking of the use made of the Hebrew records by New Testament writers, the Rev. John A. T. Robinson tells us that 'there was a certain divine pattern which, like a watermark, they believed could be detected repeating itself in any genuine piece of *Heilsgeschichte*. The outlines of this pattern were given, in the main, in the events of Israel's national history, but they could equally well appear in the much smaller scale of an individual's life story'.[9]

Variations in the scheme appear, but they do not obscure the design. Dealing with a subject akin to that of Mr. Robinson, Dr. Dodd states that 'the Word of God, while it is adapted to different historical levels, and did not come in exactly the same terms to Abraham and Moses, to Jeremiah and the first Christians, is nevertheless found always to conform to the same general pattern'.[10]

6 *The Throne of David* p. 29.
7 *The Authority of the Old Testament* p. 109.
8 *The Authority of the Old Testament* p. 146.
9 Article, *Hosea and the Virgin Birth,* in *Theology,* October 1948, p. 373.
10 *The Bible Today* p. 134.

With Mr. Robinson he finds that the design is present both in national history and in private biography. He says, for example, that the Babylonian Captivity and the Restoration show us 'the pattern on which God shaped the history of His people. In Baptism the same pattern is applied, through Christ, to the individual'.[11] And Baptism is not the only rite which binds, reveals and explains the common and the private life. 'The sacraments', he adds later, 'thus provide a pattern of the way in which the historical and corporate become individual and contemporary'.[22]

No doubt the authors just quoted would fail to maintain unanimity throughout the extension of their thoughts to all the details liable to be affected. But the degree of agreement they do reach is remarkable—and no less startling is the difference between what they see in Scripture and what was seen by their Liberal predecessors. They do not now ask us to see in the Bible the germination and growth of a seed, or the development of a germ, or the dawning of God-consciousness. What they show us instead is a Structure. We are to see Bible history as a closed series of events of which each reveals a given, recognizable pattern. Religion has the same shape as the history, and we are to find public event and personal experience, which share a pattern or patterns, meeting in it and becoming one. And the Bible, the record and the authentic interpreter of both religion and the history, must necessarily be of the same character: it is an organic whole, with each constituent part in vital, significant relation to all other parts.

Such is the view of Scripture and its interpretation held by those who are taking part in the widespread 'post-Liberal' movement. In this 'patternistic' structure—the description is rough but ready —they ask us to see the Bible as it is, as it claims to be and as it behoves us to accept and obey it. Such a view of Scripture undoubtedly offers us much, giving us a Bible which is a unity and a Revelation and showing us Religion and the History of the Old and New Israel as the work of God. And its claim is not hard to recognize: the difficulty is, indeed, to see the Scripture as other than a work showing a repeated pattern—or, perhaps, repeated patterns. It has been shaped in different ways. The small literary units composing it are developments, built up out of primitive particles by the mind and will of a community. Again, the traditions which came together to form the books of the Bible were not assembled in any haphazard manner; on the contrary, they were put in place as carefully as bricks are laid by men who work with a plan of the building they are erecting before their eyes.

11 Op. cit. p. 161.
12 Op. cit. p. 162.

The compilers of the Bible, Old and New Testaments, believed fervently in a Scheme, which they used the literature of their people, by selection, omission and arrangement, to exhibit and defend. A repeated pattern was in their minds, a pattern which they believed was discernible in the history of Israel, and they shaped the Bible in order that it might be shown. Beyond doubt there is Design in Scripture.

But to accept the existence of pattern in the Bible and to acknowledge its validity as a guide to interpretation are two different matters. Knowledge of how the first was achieved may easily lead some to doubt the second. For many of the stones in the building are very rough-hewn and look extremely awkward in the places into which they have been forced. Such a unity as is required may not be conceded without considerable hesitation and qualification.

Again, the very nature of the pattern offered may make it unacceptable. For it is not enough to call it a 'fundamental idea' and expect it to be received without question. Like other so-called 'fundamental ideas' it did not spring to life full-grown and without antecedents in the minds of the writers. It came, instead, as a conclusion, as an interpretation of events and experiences, and it was reached through a whole world of preconceptions and hypotheses.

These 'presuppositions'—the word keeps recurring with the regularity of King Charles the First in Mr. Dick's Memorials—offer difficulties of their own. They were themselves not purely theological, but were as little 'theological' and as much 'scientific' as the idea of evolution to Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century, and they have long been deposed from any position of trust. We cannot help asking whether, if we have discarded these interpretative instruments, we can still accept the conclusions to which they led. And, when that question is asked, another will offer itself, whether the presuppositions from which the post-Liberal movement starts are as truly Biblical as is claimed.

An answer to this second question may clarify the problem. It is most easily to be reached through a further study of the word 'pattern' as it appears in modern writings. This term, and the special interest it denotes, must not be thought of as the possession only of works on Biblical interpretation. They are, on the contrary, characteristic of every field of modern study.

We meet the term 'pattern' in Biblical scholarship outside the range of interpretation. Form-criticism and traditio-historical criticism assure us that the original unit of Scripture is not to be found in the book, chapter or lengthy document but in the very short story, stanza, law, prophecy, hymn, preaching or homily.

They show us how these brief units have grown or been developed in accordance with recognizable laws. We are to study them in isolation and comparatively to discern their patterns and see their common design. 'Pattern' is the key-word, the accepted technical term, in this study.

It is also a significant term in other departments of study and research. Its importance does not, of course, lie merely in its general use. It might be widely used without involving any great issue. The witchery of fashion can beguile even the best of men into the frequent and even tedious use of catch-words. Further, all the separate sciences might employ the term and yet have nothing in common beyond sound and spelling. Abstracted as they are from one another and from total reality, the sciences are apt to assign different meanings to the same term, each suiting its own needs and disregarding the practice in other systems. But here there need be no hesitation. It is not only the letters and sound of the word that are in common use: it is the interest which the term denotes that is universal.

Of course structure has been of interest in other days. But we have lately seen an intensification of the interest and an enlargement of its use. Not only are designs now being detected where hitherto none have been suspected; it is also true that long-known and newly discovered structures are being used, by examination of their similarities and variations, to bring fresh facts to light. Patterns have achieved a new importance: they have become not so much the end as the beginning of knowledge.

Evidence of the reach and strength of this interest can easily be produced. It is present in works on subjects so diverse as sociology, comparative religion, anthropology, the physical sciences, history, philosophy and the theory of art. The material situation and the moral and emotional temper of the age may have something to do with its rise; but, whatever the reason, the power of this interest is undeniable. As for the word 'pattern', it is merely the technical term which was bound to make its appearance and claim acceptance. And no one can say that it and the interest it defines have not been accepted. Workers in many fields are now looking on the idea of design almost as Dr. Dodd says the early Liberal Biblical scholars looked on the theory of evolution, as 'a universal key to knowledge of the world and of men'.[13] 'Patternism' is as characteristic of our age as any idea could be. It is the intellectual New Look, the Great Presupposition of the day.

In its devotion to pattern and design, therefore, the post-Liberal movement would seem to be starting from a position not wholly Biblical. It shares the underlying interest and ideas of thinkers

[13] *The Bible Today*, p. 26.

generally and is on remarkably good terms with the spirit of the age. Indeed, it may even be argued that the undeniable attractiveness of this 'patternist' view of the Bible is due less to any kinship with ancient times than to its sheer modernity. And the possibility cannot be ignored that at some future date, if and when thought in general has moved away from the present underlying world of ideas and hypotheses, Biblical scholars will be found reproaching their predecessors of the mid-twentieth century for an unworthy trust in categories which could only betray them and lead them astray.

Of course that need not happen. After all, it is not for love of scientific ideas as such that Liberalism is now being condemned, but for dependence on scientific ideas which are alien to Scripture. It may be that modern science has at last, or once again, found itself in accord with Biblical categories. If it has, then the judgment will not come. Yet the lesson of Liberalism remains to give us an uneasy mind. We must reflect that it is as difficult today as it was a hundred years ago to decide what belongs to the spirit of the age and what to the Spirit of the Ages. And in consequence we must be reluctant to claim finality or even comprehensiveness for any system whatsoever.

That issue is, however, for the future. There is one with which we can deal today. Attachments harmless and even laudable in themselves have been known to promote extravagances and persuade to error. There are several ways in which the present preoccupation with design may lead the zealous student of the Bible astray.

First, there is the possibility that enthusiasm will strain the language of Scripture and force it to yield patterns which were not put there in the beginning. A tendency to do so has often been noticed. Metaphors must not be read as more than metaphors without good reason.

Men have always had to rely on imagery for the communication of ideas. Some figures have probably been in use from the earliest times and may never pass out of use. We still assign significance to great events of the past and still use them to interpret the expected future. Such things as birth, marriage and death, victory and defeat, enslavement and liberation, kingship, law and priesthood, hunger and bread and thirst and water are figures which in varying proportions have expressed and still do express the whole life of humanity. Moreover, successive generations, sharing one past and one hope for the future, are likely to develop a community of images which will give their writings a well-marked unity; to strangers this unity may appear essential, organic and vital, and yet to those within the tradition it may be nothing more than a convenient and inevitable means of expression. Mere *likeness* may

be intended, and we must be on our guard lest our predilection for structures turns it without warrant into *identity*.

The second temptation might almost be called the opposite of the first. It is that we should give an uncritical welcome to those patterns which so obviously are present in Scripture when truth and religion might be better served by their transformation or even their rejection. Here we return to the consideration of 'presuppositions' and to the question whether, when they change, some alteration ought not to be made in the interpretations they have inspired.

That Biblical view of history which contemplates all events as contained in a closed series may be taken as an example. This teaching is scarcely the 'fundamental idea' it is often called. It is rather a conclusion dependent for its validity (at least so far as the Scriptural authors are concerned) on premises which may not be fully disclosed, an interpretation of events and experiences achieved by the help of a system of ideas which themselves are not systematically set out. These premises or ideas were not specifically theological, but were merely the working assumptions of the day, ranging from scientific to metaphysical thought; and, being what they were, they have largely been left behind. Among them, one element which had a strong influence on the theory of history was a certain assumption about the relation of cause and effect—an assumption which the modern mind is quite unable to accept. It proclaims, for one thing, the validity of 'sympathetic magic', and, for another, it suggests that the Hebrew mind was never quite able to see a difference between the future tense and the subjunctive mood. We have come a long way from this doctrine, as we have come far from many of the underlying ideas of the Bible: we cannot help asking what validity there can be for us in those interpretations of fact and state which they permitted and directed.

The difficulty involved goes far and deep. The main accomplishment of modern Biblical study has not been the establishment of a documentary theory or anything of the sort: it has been the uncovering of the underlying ideas of the authors and their times. Never again will any generation be able to interpret the Bible as an expression of the interpreting generation's ideas. We must begin with the underlying ideas of Biblical times and proceed from them to the interpretations which were reached through them. And as we consider how the presuppositions—assumptions about the nature of man, the lower animals and inanimate things, assumptions about psychology, time, causality and good and evil—have become unacceptable without great transformation, we cannot help suspecting that the conclusions which they shaped must also undergo some adaptation before we can really make them our own.

Indeed, we may have done so without thinking. We cannot look out on the world of experience with the eyes of our spiritual forefathers. In spite of all that is said of the need to judge Scripture by its own ideas, we can never quite do so. The interpretative equipment which we cannot help bringing to it is peculiarly our own. It comes to us from a hundred sources. The Bible itself has influenced us, but so also has the scientific thought of the modern world. Many ideas have come to us from the East, but how much do we not owe to the persistent values of the north of Europe! Our critical apparatus is, so to speak, forced on us, and we cannot put it aside. What we see, we can comprehend and express only by the help it gives. It is not all theological in the narrower sense of the term, but is 'general thought', a body of symbols which we use to express any part of experience. And we must use it. Only through our own symbols and in our own terms can we interpret either the facts or the record of Revelation. Any other course will end in futility and unreality.

This method of readjustment is not new. The pages of the Bible itself seem to exhibit it. There is evidence of the presence there of more than one set of presuppositions and of more than one interpretation of experiences. Out of different thought-worlds emerged different explanations of what had been and what was to be, and the right of the past to prescribe its forms seems never to have occurred to any generation. There is no reason why we should adopt another practice. It is clear that we shall have patterns, and it is unlikely that anyone will demand that the pattern, or patterns, of Scripture should be condemned as useless; but it is impossible that the design which Biblical writers put in Scripture can be accepted by us as precisely what it was to them, and we ought not to strain credulity in order to be able to accept what is, after all, unnecessary. Our patterns must rise naturally out of our encircling system of thought and must not do violence to it. We must resist the tendency to find release and rest from thought in the patterns which satisfied a past age. That way lies obscurantism.

A third danger is that, in our complacency, we should believe our well-patterned system to be full and final. The age has not yet dawned which can capture in its counters and symbols the whole radiance of God. Something is always left unrecognized and unappropriated.

Certain things were left out of the Scheme in the Old Testament. There is significance in what Jeremiah spoke regarding the Exile and the Restoration; but that is not all the prophet's contribution to religion. There is also the great accession of light in Jeremiah's own soul, that understanding, which divides the past from the future, of how God makes Himself known to His own.

Again, there is magnificence in the spectacle which Israel presents, after the Return, of a nation establishing a rule and worship of God. But God had also offered Israel a potent Word when, through a nameless, exquisitely sensitive poet, He spoke of a Suffering Servant. Yet the peace-bringing realization of Jeremiah and the image of sacrificing, self-giving consecration in the poems of the unknown prophet are not taken up into any scheme by later writers in the Old Testament. They did not fit into the conventional Scheme.

A similar situation meets us in the New Testament. There Jesus is named or implied to be Prophet, Priest, King, Messiah, Wisdom and perhaps Law. In our terms He is the Pattern which was exhibited in the history of Israel and in its Record. But it may well be maintained that He is not, that on the other hand He is the Denial of any claim that these things are sufficient. He is the Always Different, the Ever Unexpected.

It may be said, even, that the pattern which He preferred was one woven out of the strands which official Jewry, as illustrated by the Old Testament, chose not to use. Such an experience as the Temptation recalls to us the torment and victory of Jeremiah rather than any of Israel's conventional symbols; its outcome, the life of devotion which ensued, is a divine confirmation of the concept of the Second Isaiah rather than anything else in the Old Testament. But the disciples, and the men who gave us the New Testament in its present form, were unable to go with Him in His experiences. We see them toiling behind, trying to find in Him what their traditions said should be there and yet always uneasily aware that He was beyond them, that their terms did not altogether describe and explain Him. It is unlikely that we have comprehended fully either Him or His work. Only the mathematics of a truly spiritual realm can express all the Truth contained in Him, and to think that our conventional symbols are satisfactory can only impoverish our religion and lessen its power.

The importance of this 'patternist' movement is great. Whither it will ultimately lead may not yet be certain. It has happened before that those who started together found that the one destination could not content them. It has even happened that, as they walked, some looked a little doubtfully at their fellow-travellers. Nevertheless the present power of the movement is great and its influence wide and deep. Probably its greatest height has not yet been reached.

THE NEW ORTHODOXY AND THE CONTEMPORARY MOOD

By E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D.

To define the spirit of the age is beyond the power of even the wisest among us. For, no sooner has one identified a particular tendency as characteristic of it, than one discovers an opposing tendency which is just as prominent. Does our time reveal its political inclinations better in the totalitarianism rampant throughout Eastern Europe or in the love of freedom which has persuaded the Western nations to sink their differences and unite? In our own country, what is it that prevails? Is it the lethargy that would surrender everything to the State in return for comfort and security, or is it the steadfast will to preserve individual liberty amid the complexities of the post-war situation? Is our taste in literature to be judged by the suggestive cover of the bookstall novel or by the intellectual interest without which a mass-reprint of Whitehead's *Adventures of Ideas* would be no business proposition? And so one might continue almost indefinitely. The point I am concerned to make is the simple one that those who oppose the contemporary mood in one respect may in another themselves be examples of it.

The purpose of what follows is to suggest that something of this kind is the case with that new orthodoxy which is the fashion in theology today. Followers of Barth and Brunner feel themselves in antagonism to their times, and the disciple of Niebuhr is never tired of repeating his master's exposure of the hollowness and self-deception of modern culture. Yet perhaps the ideas for which they stand would not have such an appeal were it not that they are as much a product of the age as a protest against it. Was it mere accident, for example, that the theological onslaught upon liberalism synchronized so nicely with the political retreat therefrom? Or that the individual was looked upon with disfavour in the Church precisely when he was threatened with absorption by the State? "A religion that refuses to exhibit its own reasonableness is fellow to a political régime that refuses to submit to a free referendum, and it is no accident that the two are products of the same age".[1]

1. A Roman Catholic scholar, Jerome Hâmer, in a recent able study of Barth, has described his position as "theological occasionalism". (Incidentally, it is worth noting that some of

[1] John Baillie: *Our Knowledge of God*, 16.

the best work on Barth has come from Roman sources. It would seem as though the fact that one is committed in advance to reject a thinker's conclusions leaves one freer to do justice to them!) We may illustrate this from Barth's conception of the Bible, of the Church, and of the Christian life.

In the first place, as Hâmer points out, he seeks to get beyond the traditional opposition within Protestantism between the literalism which would bind one to the letter of inspired Scripture and the spiritualism for which the seat of authority is the Inner Light or some form of religious experience. The Bible is not for him the Word of God in the sense that it was written in its several parts to divine dictation, but in the sense that God can *make* it His Word, as, when, and how it pleases Him to do so. It is, so to speak, a mere occasion for a divine action which is entirely sovereign over against the means which it employs.

In the second place, the Church is not regarded by Barth as a sacred institution founded by Christ, but as something which is constituted afresh on each occasion on which, by Word or sacrament, God communicates Himself. The Church exists, that is to say, sporadically, from event to event, as, when, and how it pleases God to bring it into being. As Barth explains in his little book *Die Schrift und die Kirche,* the Church is a dynamic reality. It is an occurrence in the midst of world-history, and it takes place wherever the grace of God manifested in Jesus Christ draws men to Himself in obedience and to each other in fellowship. Again and again, he employs for it the category of "event". It is constituted in the moment when Christ's sovereignty elicits our free consent, when the Word is spoken with authority and is received with faith. It would seem therefore that the institutional side of the Church exists only to provide the occasion for the act of God which brings it into being, now at this moment and now again at that.

It would be easy to show how precisely the same "occasionalism" governs the account of human nature in the latest volume of Barth's *Dogmatik*. But it will suffice to show that it is characteristic also of the Christian life as he understands it. There he rejects Brunner's scheme of the "orders" and throws the Christian back upon a moment-by-moment obedience to God's commandment as this is revealed in His Word. True, here also literal obedience to what is laid down in Scripture is not called for. What God said to Gideon or to Paul was what each of them required in his concrete situation, and we who come after should hear in and out of this what God says to us today. But there is no room for "principles" in the life of obedience, only for unconditional acceptance of that which God is pleased to demand of us at any given moment. Here also the final appeal is to the divine sovereignty. We never possess

God, we never know in advance what He wills; all that happens in the world below is but as an occasion which He takes or does not take, as He wills, in order to communicate with us.

It should not be difficult to see that in all this Barth is influenced by the thought of the time. He lives in an age which delights in movement and action, for which, indeed, to describe a thing as "static" is sufficient to condemn it, in which the "dynamic" is *ipso facto* approved. He breathes a philosophical atmosphere in which the category of substance withers and that of the event flourishes. That "man has no nature but is a history" is a commonplace of the Existentialists, and one may doubt whether Barth is wholly independent of them. More serious is the fact that the whole conception of God's sovereignty which is implied in this theological occasionalism belongs to a generation which has discarded the democratic rule of law for a régime in which the will of the Leader is the criterion of good and evil. The repudiation of natural law and natural theology is an integral part of Barth's system. For him the universe has no constitution; man is wholly delivered over to a Will he may not challenge, but must simply accept.

2. A second feature of the new orthodoxy is its repudiation of the liberal insistence on objectivity and impartiality in historical study. Time was when it was considered the historian's duty to rid his mind of all preconceptions and to devote himself to a recovery of what actually took place. It is now urged that nothing of the kind is possible, that in fact every historian has his own point of view which disposes him to select and emphasize some of the facts available to him at the expense of others. The secular historian fondly imagined that he had come nearer to the truth when he gave chapters to political and economic factors and relegated religion to a footnote. But he was not achieving objectivity, he was merely yielding to his own prejudices. In this sphere, objectivity is apt to amount to little more than the state of mind in which one is governed by the common and therefore unconscious assumptions of one's time. "The fact that the principle of selection is not consciously present to the minds of the selectors does not mean that it does not exist; it merely means that it is more than ever likely to be a source of bias and error".[2]

From this an important conclusion is drawn. At the beginning of this century it was widely supposed that the New Testament was largely discredited as history because it was written from the standpoint of Christian faith. Only when one had worked backwards by a process of criticism and elimination from the Christ of the Church's worship to the Jesus of history could one be sure of firm ground beneath one's feet. Now, however, it is asserted

2 Alan Richardson: *Christian Apologetics*, 97.

that since all history, even that which purports to be scientific, is a product of faith, we must accept the Church's faith or be for ever cut off from history. Either the apostolic witness or sheer scepticism—that, we are constantly told, is the alternative before us. One writer goes so far as to imagine the Apostles foreseeing our modern difficulties and planning in advance to meet them. "The Apostles themselves took care to ensure that we should be left in no doubt as to the nature of their testimony. They left us the Holy Scriptures. They themselves would pass away and would be unable to exercise their authority in person in our midst any more, but they would leave us their solemn testimony to the words and works, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ their Lord, and with that in our hands we should be able to discern the truly Apostolic preaching from the false".[3]

Whereas, on the liberal view, tradition was something to be scrutinized with care, since what was bound up with a community was likely to have suffered distortion in the interests of that community, we are now told that it is precisely this close connection with a community which guarantees the truth of what it hands down to posterity. "History is always the concern of a historical group and not of an individual. . . . Those occurrences become historical events which have a public meaning for some historical society, reinforcing the particular ambitions and ideals of that society, or creating a crisis in the realization of its central purpose. . . . Each group carries its own psychical atmosphere, its peculiar climate of meaning and is able to do so because of its remembered past".[4] "The Apostolic testimony is not a dead voice from the past but a living witness to something which was and is a fact: the Apostolic witness did not die when the last of the Apostles died, for witness within a community does not die like the contents of yesterday's newspapers: it continues as long as the historical community itself, and thus the Church remains an Apostolic community because, like the Apostles themselves, it is a witness of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead".[5]

Did space permit, one might point out the fallacious character of this whole position, with its exploitation of the various meanings of the word "history", and its tacit assumption that the bias inevitable to the historian is something to be encouraged rather than something to be kept under restraint. It will be enough here to call attention to the remarkable agreement on this point between the Christian and the Marxist. Common to both is the rejection of history as capable of arbitrating between rival ideologies and the glorification of it as a mere instrument for the service of one's

3 D. T. Jenkins: *The Nature of Catholicity*, 28.
4 E. C. Rust: *The Christian Understanding of History*, 16.
5 Alan Richardson: *Op. cit.*, 169.

own ideology. The Communist knows quite well that history must promote "the particular ambitions and ideals" of a group. He says frankly that it must be dominated by the party-line. Wherein does the Christian differ from him? If our neo-orthodox friends are right, not at all. There is no such thing as impartial history, but each group has its own version of its past, and since that past is accessible only to those who share the ideology which dominates the group, agreement can never be reached, since discussion cannot so much as begin.

3. In the writings of Niebuhr the traditional concept of human sinfulness comes again into its own, and in a disciple like D. R. Davies it is insisted upon with what seems a positive delight in the contemplation of one's fellows as a *massa perditionis*. Pride, we are told, is the sin which appears under the most diversified forms. Man seeks to build a tower whose top will reach to heaven; he desires to be as God, knowing good and evil. It is precisely the most highly organized political structures, the empires of the ancient world and the totalitarian despotisms of the twentieth century, which exemplify this basic sinfulness. Man imagines that he can give to his achievements a significance which will outlive the changes of history. He proposes to cure even his worst evils by foresight, planning, and organization. Finally, he usurps the place of the Creator and intends, by the use of political or even of biological expedients, to make something worth while at last of the human stuff which nature has left so incomplete. The *credo* of modern man is his self-sufficiency and of this no disaster seems able to disillusion him.

That there is, in our time, a superficiality, a blindness to the tragic elements in history and to the possibilities of self-deception in the individual life is true enough and Niebuhr has done a service in pointing it out. But there is also a vein of cynicism which provides a secular counterpart to the theologian's emphasis on human perversity. There are psychologists who seem to delight in reducing the noblest human actions to the meanest forms of self-interest, if not, at times, to something of even coarser grain. There is a widespread reluctance to credit any statesman with a good motive, even where the Marxist simplification of all conduct, however idealistic, in terms of class-interest is not accepted. Even when the theologian rebukes the confidence of the age in its own virtue, he recognizes that he has an ally in Freud and Marx. In other words, the new emphasis on human sinfulness, if it is a reaction against some tendencies of the age, is an expression of others. Especially in the writings of D. R. Davies does one observe a kinship between the cynicism of the secular intellectual and the theologian's systematic denigration of his kind.

But there is another, and perhaps even more important, parallel

to which attention may be drawn. The conception of sin with which the new orthodoxy works is dramatic, even sensational. Niebuhr is typical of the modern man whose mind is fed by the Press and the radio till he accepts as a complete picture of human life those extracts from it which minister to a corrupt taste. The sins of which he thinks are those which get into the headlines and force themselves upon our notice by their disastrous outcome. He misses therefore the sins which go unobserved and unreported, the commonplace fears and cowardices of which we are all of us guilty. A Hitler or a Stalin may embody in a single striking figure the urge to be as God and to reduce one's fellows to mere instruments. But the world suffers perhaps more from misplaced good intentions, from the self-mistrust that keeps a man from acting on his vision of good, and from the fear of consequences that inhibits the will. And, perhaps, for one person whose titanic pride calls for rebuke, there are twenty who need to be heartened to face with courage a daunting situation. Everyone who has had anything to do with the cure of souls knows how many men and women there are who fail, not because they are over-confident, but because they do not trust their God-given powers.

One more point is perhaps worth making. Is there not a possibility that the new emphasis on sin as pride is a subtle form of the pride which is sin? How it ministers to our self-conceit to imagine ourselves builders of a Tower of Babel, aspirants to the throne of the universe! There is a satisfaction to be got out of dramatizing oneself in this way, instead of accepting the fact that we sin in small, mean, cowardly ways which do not deserve to have notice taken of them. To be Judas betraying his Master for silver, or Caiaphas sacrificing Him to save a nation would at least invest us with a certain importance. We should be sinners worth talking about! But in reality we are not like that, we are the disciples who slipped away and made themselves safe, the soldiers who did as they were told and then brought out the dice.

4. When Niebuhr's *Interpretation of Christian Ethics* appeared, there was a novelty about it which ensured its success. It proclaimed an alliance between radicalism in politics and orthodoxy in religion. One must keep to the left on one road and to the right on the other. The position taken up in the book seems to be that we can trust the powers inherent in the Christian message provided we do not trust them too much. The ingrained immorality of society sets limits to what it can hope to accomplish. It would appear that there even God is halted. "Individuals may be saved by repentance, which is the gateway to grace. The recognition of creatureliness and finiteness, in other words, may become the basis of man's reconciliation to God through his resignation to his finite condition. But the collective life of mankind promises no such

hope of salvation, for the very reason that it offers men the very symbols of pseudo-universality which tempt them to glorify and worship themselves as God".[6] At this point, at any rate, we must acquiesce in an ineradicable sin.

The whole aim of Niebuhr seems to be to construct an ethic which will be politically practicable. It is because he operates with that standard that he must describe the morality of the Gospels as impossible, shutting his eyes to the fact that the concluding verses of the Sermon on the Mount make it clear that Jesus laid what He had said upon the consciences of His hearers, as something upon which they were to act in the present. It is for the same reason that he reduces to a minimum what can be done by the individual under God's direction and allows the course of events to be determined by political and economic forces, with God operating obscurely in the background and reserving any intervention on His part for the end of the process. He lives in a world already pre-empted by the systems and parties of the hour and can only recommend such action as they permit. Nor does he seem in the least conscious of the gulf which separates his ethic of the politically practicable from that of the New Testament, for which all things are possible to faith.

The penultimate paragraph of the book already cited brings this out clearly. "It may be that the insights of a prophetic religion may qualify and mitigate the cruelties of the social struggles through which we are passing to a greater degree than now seems probable. It is comforting to know, nevertheless, that if this should not prove true, the truth of prophetic religion, and of Christianity in so far as Christianity is truly prophetic, must survive the tempests of a dying civilization as an ark survives the flood".[7] Can one imagine the imprisoned Paul consoling himself with the thought that his Gospel might perhaps "qualify and mitigate" the heathenism and immorality of the Roman Empire? Or John Woolman using similar language of slavery? Had either of them thought in such terms, history would have swept them away as powerless to affect it. The men who have changed the course of events have dared what was judged politically impracticable and brought it to pass.

It would be unfair to end this section with such a criticism. Or rather, let us confess frankly that such criticism must be directed against ourselves as much as against Niebuhr. The secret of his appeal lies in the fact that he has put into words what is in all our hearts. We are Christians of a later day, victims of the disillusionment of our time, very sure of such things as the rate of exchange and the terrors of the atom bomb, but pitifully uncertain of God, except as some vague Presence over all and some Judge who may

[6] *Op. cit.*, 99f.
[7] *Op. cit.*, 247.

wind up all at the last. We are hampered at every moment in our following of Christ by doubts and fears; it seems as though the future is being shaped by forces we cannot control, so that the most we can hope to do is to infuse a little kindliness and charity into the strife we can do nothing to prevent. Niebuhr has given us the kind of ethic that is within our reach, all perhaps that we are capable of. Let us confess with shame that this is so and do the best we can. But let us not pretend that in so doing we have anything in common with the world-conquering, buoyantly confident spirit of the New Testament.

I have tried to show, in these four instances, that even if the new tendencies in theology are opposed to the spirit of the age in some respects, in others they are its expression, perhaps even its product. This is not necessarily an argument against their validity. But it does justify an appeal for humility. Each generation of theologians is conscious of how the generation before it made terms with the spirit of the age, and is unaware when it does the same in its turn. We need to develop a sense of humour which would save us from foolishly supposing that we somehow have access to the Word of God, pure and undefiled. Neo-orthodoxy is not the revelation of a long forgotten truth; it is a fashion which suits the time to which it belongs and will die out as the time changes. Let its champions reflect that in fifty years time the merest tyro in theology will be speaking of Barth and Brunner as they speak today of Troeltsch and Harnack. True, we must live by our convictions, but we should never confuse them with the absolute wisdom of God. But the recognition in theory that such a distance exists does not save us from acting as though it were not there.

The criticism of neo-orthodoxy here offered is not a plea for a return to liberalism. We cannot return to anything, we must go forward to what lies in the future. A distinction must be drawn between the liberal spirit itself and the forms which it assumes under particular conditions, say in the first decade of this century. The liberalism of forty years ago was defective in many respects and we should not be ashamed to learn from those who have criticized it. Barth has taught us that our concern is not with our private experience but with the objective reality to which that experience witnesses. We do not despair of impartiality in history, a relative impartiality which will enable us to prevent faith from degenerating into credulity, but we realize, as an earlier generation did not, how arduous is the task. If we reject necessitarian and collectivist accounts of sin, we shall recognize all the more acutely where our personal responsibility lies. Finally, if we maintain that Christian faith moves mountains and does not merely walk round them, we shall be ready to acknowledge that we rather aspire to such faith than possess it.

COLIN AND PERIGOT

Dulce est desipere in loco

By Nathaniel Micklem, D.D.

With long-drawn toil and anxious cares forespent,
In search of respite to alleviate
His burdened spirit, Colin and his mate
Twice weekly to the picture-houses went,
If haply merriment
At human folly or at capering clown
Or clattering hooves or sudden pistol-shot
From western prairies might his troubles drown,
And all his mental turmoils be forgot.
Perchance some tangled plot
Of derring-do, of violence and of blood
Depicted, would restore his tranquil mood;
Or tale of seeking and requited love
Or enterprise of Disney's duckling brood
His medicine would prove
And his malease remove.
Ah, let him take his seat and gape and smile,
And from the oppressive world escape awhile.

Respect his habit, and account him less,
Not more, blameworthy than poor Perigot,
Who seeks to dulcify his toilsome lot
And triumph o'er his mind's prolonged distress
And spirit's feebleness,
Or to asperge the turpitudes that smirch
The huckster's traffic in the market-place,
By spending all his leisure hours in church,
That he may there agreeably efface
By copious draughts of grace
The mark and memory of worldly things;
He listens, prays, prostrates himself or sings,
Feeling, within, a comfortable glow,
Or seems to mount aloft on angels' wings
Leaving far, far below
The cares that rack him so.
And should not man thus rise above things vile,
And from the oppressive world escape awhile?

But, though 'religion never was designed
To make our pleasures less', as Isaac Watts
Has clearly stated, yet poor Perigot's
Painful device, like one who draws the blind
To shut out all mankind,
Would make of faith, as Marxists rightly judge,

An anaesthetic or an opiate,
A trick like those performed by Mr. Sludge
(But who reads Browning now?), a blissful state
For those more fortunate.
Diversion is a gift from Heaven. I pen
These lines for my diversion, and the men
Who play before us we may not despise,
But, if it please us, visit now and then;
Yet somewhat otherwise
Religion I would prize
Than means whereby our tedium to beguile
And from the oppressive world escape awhile.

Cried Job in his dismay, 'O that I knew
Where I might find Him!' Where shall man best look?
In sacred shrine or in some holy book?
Ever in ghostly rite his search renew
Or in profound review
Of learnéd tomes? Or haply in the woods
Or by the plashing waves or where soft peace
Upon the flowery dales and meadows broods?
Here shall he find in Deity release,
And here his searchings cease?
Shall he, transported by the organ's sound,
To heaven ascend? Rather will God be found,
As once He was, 'mid scenes of crime and woe,
In market-place, on execution-ground,
Or where poor travellers go
Unarmed to Jericho,
And missed of them that loiter in the aisle
And from the oppressive world escape awhile.

Now God be praised for stately minuet,
For good Sir Roger, for the poet's rhyme,
For motley, for the conjuror's skill, for mime,
For fragrant weed, for cards in order set,
For cheerful castanet,
And (be the same, of course, discreetly used)
The grapes' kind juices and the barley mow,
For fair romance and anagrams confused
And hawk-eyed sleuths! Bid weary Colin go
To see his moving show:
Let Perigot go with him, if he tire.
Better the beauteous chorus than the choir
In church for man's diversion. Let him sense
The awe and dread of Heaven's consuming fire,
Nor holy spasms intense
Mistake for reverence.
So let him respite take in jocund style
And from the oppressive world escape awhile.

THE ANALOGY OF THE 'OTHER MIND'

By J. R. Jones, M.A., D.Phil.

Having occasion, in the early thirties, to assess the grounds of our belief in the existence of God, the late Professor Stocks expressed the view that this belonged to a class of beliefs for which we are accustomed to rely on analogy, but that a "satisfactory analogy" was "here wanting".[1] If by this he meant that nobody to date had thought of a situation with which the assurance of Divine Existence could plausibly be compared, he cannot have known of the new approach which certain continental thinkers were then making to the problem of the mind's knowledge of other minds. Nearly a decade had gone by since men like Ebner, Buber, Greisbach and Gogarten had begun to explore the possibilities of an analogy which, they believed, carried important suggestions for the solution of the problems of Theism. The analogy was the one between the way these writers supposed we 'knew' God and our so-called 'knowledge' of one another. "The relation with man", Martin Buber had announced in 1923, "is the real simile of the relation with God".

It is not surprising that this analogy should since have been taken over and exploited by the movement in twentieth century Protestant theology which is associated with the name of Dr. Karl Barth. To men like Barth, Brunner and Heim, who were faced with the problem of squaring their massive reaffirmation of divine transcendence with the belief that God may nevertheless be *known,* the fact at once assumed supreme significance that there should appear to be an analogous situation in human experience where the 'transcendence' of an object did not preclude its, at least partial, knowability. God, they insist, is not 'at our disposal' as an object which we can discover for ourselves. He is an absolute Mystery, which remains hidden until, by *His own* initiative, He makes Himself known. And, although they profess to welcome the charge of anti-rationalism, it is with evident satisfaction that these writers point to what they claim to be an analogous situation to this in the transcendence of one finite mind by another by reason of the complete inability of minds to become directly accessible to each other's perception. "There is nothing of You", writes Karl Heim, "that I can see. Telescope or microscope will not help. For my consciousness, You are transcendent".

The analogy is exploited in two basic articles of the Barthian faith: that God is not an Object but a Subject, a Thou, not an It;

1 *On the Nature and Grounds of Religious Belief,* Riddell Memorial Lectures, p. 23.

and that He, accordingly, makes Himself known in the only way (they believe) a subject or person *can* make himself known, viz., by self-disclosure or 'revelation'. "We can", writes Brunner, "ourselves find the clue to things; they confront us . . . as objects which, by processes of research and thought, we can learn to understand. But persons are not enigmas of this kind; a person is a mystery which can be disclosed only through self-manifestation. . . . But God is Person absolutely, not *a* subject, but absolute Subject. . . . He can be known . . . only through the fact that He makes Himself known through His own action. . . . He is not at our disposal as an object of knowledge".[2]

Now I feel certain that this new departure in the epistemology of religion, of which so much is expected in some quarters[3], calls for a far more critical treatment than is generally being accorded to it. It seems to me that there are several crucial points at which the analogy in question breaks down. The point of collapse, however, is not the same for the 'orthodox' Barthian concept of revelation as it is for the wider and somewhat more liberal concept which is associated with the name of Emil Brunner. While sharing Barth's concern to exclude the possibility of a source of religious knowledge outside revelation, this writer does not deny that, in addition to the special, historical revelation in Jesus Christ, God employs *Nature* as a medium of self-disclosure. He holds, that is, that there is what he calls a 'revelation in the Creation'. He distinguishes between the special, or personal, and a general, or impersonal, divine revelation. The special revelation is the revelation in the unique historical Event of Jesus of Nazareth. It is personal and redemptive. The general revelation is the revelation of God in the works of Nature. This has no redemptive function, but it has what might be called an epistemic one. It makes God known, or, rather, *could* make Him known under conditions which are not, however, in fact fulfilled.

This naturalistic deviation in the Barthian movement avoids the extremes of a rationalism which would suppose the existence of God to be demonstrable by an *argument from* Nature. Brunner makes quite clear that his doctrine of a revelation in the Creation has nothing whatever to do with the traditional 'physico-theological' proof. He in fact repudiates all attempts at speculative demonstration of the existence of God as an affront to the supreme majesty of One whose being is a mystery—completely impenetrable by human reason. His contention seems to be that there is (or could be) a manifestation of God in Nature which is quite independent of the attempt to argue from Nature to God. Nature, on this view, in Prof. Baillie's phrase, becomes a sacrament of God without being an argument for Him.

2 *Revelation and Reason*, p. 24. 3 Vide *Our Knowledge of God*, Baillie, chap. v.

It is a view which combines the advantages of imprecision with a reasonableness which has commended it to not a few philosophers. Cook Wilson and Kemp Smith in particular have argued that Nature yields assurance of the existence of God not by furnishing the premises of a rational demonstration, but by evoking, through sense-perception, a certain *immediate experience* in which this assurance is to be found. Kemp Smith suggests that the reason why Hume and Kant, while rejecting the Teleological Proof on logical grounds, are evidently themselves moved by the contemplation of Nature into casting doubt on their own conclusions, is that Nature *does* produce an overwhelming impression upon us but that the effect of this is not, in fact, to suggest the thought of design and so become the premise of an inference to a Designer, but to generate in us an immediate experience of a characteristic sort. This is the experience of 'awe', and it is somehow in this experience, Kemp Smith maintains, and not by argument from the facts of adaptation and design, that assurance of the Divine is obtained[4]. He observes that where the religious note is genuinely authentic, as in the Old Testament, there is no question of first observing order and design and then inferring a Designer. Brunner likewise notes that in the Bible "there is never any talk of a process of argument leading to a conclusion; it is always concerned with a *revelation* of God in His works. . . ." This is partly evident in the dénouement which its author contrived for the drama of the Book of Job. God seeks to bring Job to his right mind by displaying Himself in His full glory and inexhaustible resourcefulness before him. But what He actually does is to draw a series of brilliant sketches in which the whole panorama of Creation both inanimate and living is made to pass before Job.

> "Who hath opened the watercourse for the rainflood
> Or a way for the lightning of thunder?
> To cause it to rain on the earth where no man is;
> On the wilderness where there is no man?
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Dost thou give strength to the war horse?
> Dost thou clothe his neck with trembling?
> Dost thou make him leap like a locust?
> The glory of his snorting is terrible . . .
> He smelleth the battle afar off
> The thunder of the captains and the shouting . . ."

There is no attempt here to argue *from* certain facts of Nature to the existence and glory of God. What Job is vouchsafed, Davidson comments, is "a display from Creation of that which God is". The pictures of Nature are a self-disclosure of the Divine in a

4 *Is Divine Existence Credible? Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xvii, 1931, pp. 220 foll.

perceptual medium. And Job's humbled reply is: "I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye *seeth* thee".

The experience which certain perceptions of Nature induce, Cook Wilson identified with 'solemn reverence'. And he argued that, just as one who feels real gratitude at the social level must believe that another person exists to whom he is grateful, so "the actual feeling of solemn reverence is only possible because we actually *do* believe in God".[5] It was from failing to understand that having the actual experience means that we *are* assured of God's existence that we seek reassurance in *arguments* such as that from Design. "No argument from design, illustrated by examples however wonderful, can have anything like the effect of a single experience of the emotions of reverence and awe. The one is but an argument, the other is a sense of the reality itself".[6]

Now an important part of what both Cook Wilson and Kemp Smith wanted to say was that, when it is thus founded in an experience which the contemplation of nature evokes, the knowledge of God resembles our knowledge of one another in an important respect. Just as we cannot experience other selves except in connection with their bodies, so, the latter writes, the Divine is experienced "solely through and in connection with what is other than the Divine". On the traditional analogical theory of the 'knowledge of other selves', this, of course, would have meant that the existence of God was known, *inferentially* known, that is to say, *through* the world and not simply *with* it. But Cook Wilson, with his demurrer against "merely inferred friends", had been the first to repudiate the Analogical Theory. And Kemp Smith makes clear that he supposes that our assurance of the existence of other persons is "based on directly experienced fellowship and not upon inference". With this proviso, it is undeniable that a knowledge of the Divine which is based on a 'revelation in the Creation' is vaguely analogous to our knowledge of one another in so far as this is mediated by the perception of material bodies of a certain characteristic sort. *But the resemblance is a perfectly general one.* It does not extend beyond the fact that the other mind, whether it be God's mind or my friend's, manifests itself to me in a perceptual medium. If we try to make the analogy more precise than this, we encounter a radical dissimilarity in the character of the media through which the self-disclosure is supposed to take place. Nothing could be plainer than that our knowledge of one another is associated with the perception of foreign bodies of a certain characteristic appearance and behaviour, or, in situations where others are not physically present, with the perception of various indirect manifestations of such bodies. Not only, then, is social consciousness founded vaguely in perception; it is

[5] *Statement and Inference,* ii, p. 864. [6] Ibid., p. 865.

invariably associated with a certain specific class of percepts. On the other hand, there appears to be no special class of perceptions with which our experience of the Divine is invariably associated. This is acknowledged on all hands. It is impossible, Stocks thought, to find "any special feature of the perceived world which justifies the proposition 'God exists' in the fashion in which certain features of experience justify the proposition, for instance, 'Elephants exist'."[7] And Clement Webb points out that while "not all objects of perception do, nor do any always, mediate the consciousness [of the Numinous], *any objects may* do so; since that of which we are aware in our religious experience is immanent in all reality . . ."[8] "There is nothing in our experience", writes Prof. Baillie, "which may not be the medium of God's self-revelation, whereas our fellow men cannot address us save through the very limited and particular medium of their own bodily organization".[9] But it is Kemp Smith, notwithstanding the analogy which he asserts exists between the two forms of knowledge, who most emphatically affirms their disparity in this respect. "We have to recognize one main difference between the experience of other selves and the experience of the Divine. Owing to the fact that we experience other selves only through and in connection with their bodies, other selves are experienced by us only in the situations in which these bodies are found. . . . In the case of the Divine, on the other hand, there are no such *isolable and constant* accompaniments. Potentially any situation may yield an immediate awareness of the Divine; actually there is no situation whatsoever which invariably yields it".[10] But surely there cannot, in that case, be any very *illuminating* analogy between the alleged Divine Presence in Nature and the felt presence of a 'mind' in the proximity of another person's body. Moreover in the account he proceeds to give, in the context, of the *origin* of religious belief, Kemp Smith seems to me to destroy the basis of the analogy altogether. It is in an overwhelming impression made upon us by Nature *as a whole,* and particularly by its vaster and more impersonal aspects, that he finds the experience through which we become assured of the existence of God. The assurance comes, he writes, "through and in connection with the cosmic setting of human life".

> "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?
> Who stretched the line upon it, if thou knowest?
> Whereupon were the foundations sunk?
> And who laid the corner-stone?
> . . . . . .
> Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth?
> Declare if thou knowest it all".

[7] Op. cit., p. 18. [8] *Our Knowledge of One Another,* p. 16. [9] Op. cit., p. 222.
[10] Op. cit., p. 230.

This is the sort of setting, Kemp Smith would suggest, in which the Divine Existence "first breaks in upon the consciousness of man". And, in his view, there can, for us, be no other path to the assurance that God exists than this spectacle of the "infinitely vast and profoundly mysterious natural order" of which we form part. But, surely, between this experience and the discovery that bodies of a certain sort are animated by minds, there is a difference of physical scale which relates the consciousness of the 'Divine Presence' to an incomparably wider range of potentially significant perceptions.

The only possibility of escaping this conclusion would be to make out that the rôle of perception in the discovery that the world is peopled by 'other persons' has been overstressed. Prof. H. H. Price seemed to be doing this in the earlier of the two papers which he wrote on the knowledge of other minds.[11] He there suggested that we may arrive at the belief in other minds by an argument from a systematic interference in our lives, of a hostile or friendly character, which looks as if it were designed. That events in my neighbourhood should have the effect of systematically either thwarting or furthering the movements by which I seek to execute my purposes, forces the conclusion that someone is responsible for those events who is *aware* of my movements and *desires* to interfere with them. Now this argument, Prof. Price points out, makes no reference whatever to the *bodies* of the interfering agencies. It could yield the conclusion that such agencies exist to a person who had "never seen another human body". For the interference could come either from an embodied agency that "worked entirely by telekinesis" or from one which "possessed no body at all". Prof. Price does admit, in the concluding paragraph, that the inference is facilitated by the observation of bodily *movements* of a purposeful sort. But the assumption of the traditional Analogical Argument that the foreign bodies should be of a characteristic *appearance* he dismisses as of no significance whatever. "Their shape or size or colour does not matter at all".

Now this view certainly removes the perceptual dissimilarity between the experience in which we become aware of a foreign source of awareness and volition and the type of experience in which assurance of the Divine is to be found. But precisely by doing this it threatens to make the two sorts of experience indistinguishable. For, dissociated from the perception of bodies of which the characteristic appearance has, initially, an even greater significance than the purposive behaviour, there is no reason why the experience of an interference which comes, vaguely, from beyond our control, should lead to the belief in *localized, human* agencies. The experience could as well lead to the belief in an imperceptible, ubiquitous Agency which systematically intervened

11 *Proc. Arist. Soc., 1932*, pp. 53-78.

either to frustrate or further the execution of our designs in the way the Occasionalist or Berkeleyan Deity was supposed to do. If, therefore, it is with our belief in other human agencies that Prof. Price is chiefly concerned, his argument does nothing to explain the origin of *this* belief, unless he supposes that the subject is able to associate the systematic thwarting of its purposes with the actions of a body of characteristic appearance and behaviour, which it perceives in at least some of the situations in which this thwarting occurs. It is only if we suppose that the designed interference is identified as coming from organisms, which not only behave in ways instrumental to this interference, but are of a highly characteristic appearance, that it can constitute evidence for the existence of finite intelligences other than ourselves. And precisely in so far as our belief in the existence of such intelligences is thus mediated by the perception of a special class of sensible objects, it ceases to have any significant analogy with our knowledge of a Being of whom it is claimed that absolutely no class of objects may not, in some circumstances or other, become the medium of His self-disclosure.

This then is the point at which the analogy seems to me to break down on Brunner's reading of the human situation, which is that man is vouchsafed a revelation of God *in the Creation*. But I doubt very much whether, as a believer in God's utter alien-ness and inaccessibility to man's natural powers of perception and discovery, Brunner had any right to such a view. He certainly ties himself in the most astonishing knots in his efforts to reconcile the commendable 'naturalist' good sense which he shows in the doctrine of the revelation in the Creation with his sneaking conviction that God is after all not really known outside the Christian, historical, revelation. What apparently called for Brunner's seeming concession to naturalism was that he assumed that, without at least the possibility of knowing God independently of the revelation in Christ, man is not in the proper sense an ethical person, responsible before God. It is because of the revelation in the Creation, or, rather, because of the possibility of it, that man is held responsible for his sin. Brunner seems to be thinking here of the passage in *Romans* where St. Paul speaks of God's eternal power and godhead being so made manifest to men in the spectacle of the visible world that ". . . they are without excuse". Their ignorance of God, that is to say, is inexcusable. But this means that it is in some sense the rejection by man of the revelation in the Creation that constitutes his sin. And since only the revelation of God in the *Word* of God has the power of redeeming from sin, it follows that it is only in and through this historical revelation that the revelation in the Creation is ultimately understood. Brunner is thus compelled both to affirm the possibility of the latter revelation, for man

otherwise *could* not be a sinner, and, at the same time, to deny the actuality of it, for, if he actually received this revelation, man would not in fact *be* a sinner. Brunner's position in the chapter on the revelation in the Creation in *Revelation and Reason* is, in consequence, a very paradoxical one. He tells us that God has impressed the stamp of His Spirit upon the world and that created things bear this stamp within themselves; they do not, that is to say, have to acquire it through the historical revelation in Christ. Yet he admits that, in order to be able to read this hall-mark of God on the contrivances of Nature, "we need the historical revelation and the faith which it creates". Our eyes need to be opened other than by Nature itself if we are to see that its tokens "do point to the true God". Thus even the revelation in the Creation "presupposes as receiver the *believing* man". But we are at the same time warned against the view that "the Creation receives the image of God through faith". "Rather", we are told, "it is faith which discovers the quality granted to it by God from the very beginning". We thus get the intolerable paradox that "the only reason why man can be a sinner is because God reveals Himself to him" in Nature, whereas, on the other hand, "it is because he *is* a sinner that this revelation cannot issue in the knowledge of God".

All this muddle suggests that the admission of a revelation of the Divine in Nature cannot be made consistent with the fundamental presuppositions of the neo-Calvinist school. And we find that Dr. Barth himself has consistently repudiated these 'rationalist' concessions of Brunner's and has, in particular, emphatically rejected his doctrine of the possibility of a revelation in the Creation. Barth makes Christ the Mediator no less of the knowledge of God than of salvation and, accordingly, denies that there is knowledge of God anywhere in the world outside the community of Christian believers. He is quoted by Prof. Baillie as saying that "only the man who knows about Jesus Christ knows anything at all about revelation", so that "the confession becomes inevitable that Jesus Christ alone is the revelation".

Are those who thus deny that there can be any road to the knowledge of God through ordinary human experience, entitled to the unchallenged use of the analogy of the 'other mind'? Even the upholders of this undiluted Barthian doctrine, however irrational they may be prepared to let their position seem, must at least wish to give it some semblance of plausibility. Have they a right to do this by leaning heavily on an alleged similarity between God's donated 'revelations' and the self-disclosures of one human personality to another?

There seem to me to be two obvious, but, nevertheless, apparently unnoticed, respects in which the latter mode of self-disclosure of a personality differs radically from the former.

(1) While it may be true, in a sense, that a man's acquaintances cannot know him as a person except in so far as he reveals himself to them, the Barthians use the term 'reveal', when they speak of divine revelation, in a sense from which it certainly does *not* follow that it is only by self-revelation that a man can make his personality known to his friends. For, in the sense in which they use the term, it is always by his own deliberate decision that a person reveals himself. Self-disclosures are voluntarily proffered or withheld. Thus Brunner stresses the necessary activity of a person in his self-disclosures, as compared with the passive accessibility of mere objects to inquiry and inspection. He speaks of God making Himself known "through His own action". Revelation, in this sense, then, is deliberate self-communication. This restricted use of the term is bound up with the whole Biblical conception of the 'Word' or Logos as God's medium of self-disclosure. The Barthians have made much of this doctrine, particularly of the New Testament identification of the Divine Logos with Jesus Christ. And they have understood the metaphor exclusively in terms of the *informative* function of words. To borrow a distinction of Dr. Broad's, they think of discourse as a 'conventional expression' of experience and ignore the sense in which it may also be a 'natural expression' of it. Just as there are certain states of a person's mind which we may not know unless that person himself decides to tell us about them in words, so, they claim, man would be completely uninformed about God if God had not Himself decided to enlighten him by speaking to him about Himself. Brunner, we have seen, thinks He speaks in Creation. But Barth insists that He spoke only in history, and only once and for all in Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus thus becomes the 'word' of God in the sense of being our only source of information about God. Jesus is the information which God, of His own free choice, decided 'in the fulness of time' to give.

Now it is perfectly true that this is analogous to the situation in which another person may volunteer to enlighten me as to the state of his own mind by speaking about himself. The situation is analogous in that the other person's state of mind may be one which could be made known to me only in this way and in that the question whether or not, in that case, his state of mind *is* to be made known depends entirely on his own free decision. But it would be quite wrong to suppose that a man's personality is revealed *only* in the verbal information which he occasionally volunteers about himself. Our fellows are constantly revealing their personalities to us as it were unconsciously. Unwittingly and involuntarily,

in the way they react in different sorts of situations, in what they do to objects that are external both to themselves and us, and not least by their gestures, facial expressions, interjections and tones of voice, the persons with whom we have to do are all the time making themselves more fully known to us. *This* 'revelation' does not have to wait upon any decision of theirs to volunteer information about themselves. Here they share the passive accessibility of mere objects to our observation and scrutiny. I see no objection to calling what happens the revelation or disclosure of one personality to another, but it is a disclosure in which we *find out for ourselves* what sort of person the other fellow is. So far from his not being 'at our disposal as an object of knowledge', we are able as it were to read off clues to his personality which he is all the time providing with no deliberate intention of doing so. A person can, of course, mislead others as to what sort of personality he has by consistent and systematic play-acting. In that sense certainly the disclosures of which I am speaking can be withheld by deliberate decision. But when a man has no reason for practising such deceit, he just goes on being the person he is. And when this happens (which one supposes is what does normally happen) everything that a man says or does, irrespective of whether what he says is said about himself, becomes to his friends an unintended disclosure of his personality.

Now there is absolutely no analogy to this in the Barthian conception of divine self-disclosure. They cannot admit a sense in which revelations of God occur which are not deliberately willed by Himself. He remains an absolute Mystery until He speaks and, when He speaks, it is not about *other things* that He speaks, in a way which would enable us, as it were, on *our* initiative, to gather what sort of being He is. He speaks about Himself and what He says about Himself we could learn in absolutely no other way. It is inevitable that the Barthians should believe this to be the manner of God's self-disclosure since they deny that He can be revealed in a contemporary perceptual medium. If there is a sense in which my friend is all the time inadvertently disclosing his personality to me, what obviously makes this possible is that he is embodied in an organism which is open to public view. It is the way I actually perceive *his body* behaving in different sorts of situations, what I perceive it doing to other bodies, the gestures it makes and the evocative or exclamatory noises which it emits, that make known to me the kind of person my friend is, independently of disclosures he may choose to make in informative statements about himself. But in our knowledge of God, as this is understood by Barth, there is nothing remotely analogous to this 'natural' self-disclosure of the Other Mind in a perceptual medium.

(2) A further and more radical difference between the two cases is the following. What I may not know about my friend until he volunteers to tell me about them are the things which go on in his mind—his thoughts, feelings and intentions. These are objects of introspection; and inspection of *another person's* introspecta, or *extraspection* as it has been called, is impossible. But there is one thing I know about my friend quite independently of any verbal information he may volunteer about himself. *I know that he exists*. It is because I am able to assume his existence and know that it is he who is speaking, that I come to know, through the sentences in which he describes his experiences, what his feelings, thoughts or intentions are. And I know that he exists, in a sense in which I do *not* know what it is that goes on in his mind, because I perceive his body. I see a physical object of characteristic appearance which, in all kinds of situations, I perceive behaving in characteristic ways, and this *perceptual* experience lies at the very roots of my knowledge of him. If we could not know that another human being existed until he was in a position to tell us so himself, one could not, for example, know that one had a child until such time as it could volunteer the verbal information that it existed. But this is absurd. I *know* that my child exists from the moment I see it. And 'seeing it' here quite obviously means seeing a living body of characteristic appearance and behaviour. It should follow, therefore, for anyone who emphatically denies, as the Barthians do, that the knowledge of God can be perceptually mediated, that we not only cannot know what manner of being God is, or what His intentions towards us are, but cannot even know that such a being as God *exists* until such time and except in so far as He himself chooses to disclose this fact to us.

It is here, it seems to me, that the analogy of the 'other mind' breaks down completely. Since I can be perceptually assured that my friend exists, I would, in the majority of cases, be prepared to risk acting on what I am told, in certain spoken or written symbols, his feelings or intentions are. But while I might be prepared to act on information thus obtained concerning another person's state of mind, I would not, on reflection, say that this information was 'knowledge' in the strict sense of indubitable knowledge. Symbols which claim to disclose or describe imperceptible existences or events are never indubitable. I cannot doubt that a person whom I see several times a day exists. But I may doubt whether he feels towards me in the way he protests he does. And had I to depend for intimation of his existence equally upon hearing words such as "I exist" being uttered, without my being able to perceive a human body from which these noises could be supposed to emanate, I would certainly find it as possible to doubt the *existence* of that person as I now do to doubt whether he has

a certain feeling which he claims he has. In the same way the existence of God is dubitable if it depends *solely* on the claim of a certain historical event, interpreted in a certain traditional way, to be the 'word' in which God once and for all informed man that He existed. And if it is possible to doubt that God exists, it is possible that He does not exist and, if it is possible that He does not exist, the possibility logically follows that there has never been a historical revelation of Him.

It seems to me that the only way out of this impasse is to admit that something analogous to our perception of other people's bodies mediates, and is in some fundamental sense the foundation of, our knowledge of the Divine. Given this admission, an assurance of God's existence could be held to underlie and make possible the belief that He revealed His love and redemptive intention towards men in some special way in Jesus of Nazareth. But it would still be true, even if we did suppose that certain 'natural' experiences could thus mediate the assurance that God exists, that the analogy with our knowledge that other selves exist would be a very remote one. For while we know that other human persons exist through perceiving particular objects of characteristic appearance and behaviour, it would only be the whole cosmic setting of our lives that could be supposed to generate the experience of 'reverence' or 'awe' in which assurance of the Divine is to be found.

WHAT IS AN EVANGELICAL?

By G. H. Woodham, M.A.

An "Evangelical" should primarily mean one who believes and seeks to spread the Gospel of Christ: if we are not Evangelical in this sense, we are not Christians. To apply the term to a party appears to beg a question of the first importance. Yet the word is a convenient one, and we must employ it for want of a better. "Protestant" will not do in its place, for not all Protestants are Evangelical, and the number of meanings which have been given to the word "Protestant" is astonishing, as the great Oxford dictionary reveals.

Moreover, "Protestant" is too negative a word to apply to Evangelicals or indeed to anybody with a strong and definite faith. It suggests a person whose main interest is opposition to Rome, and such persons do exist. But Evangelicals, as such, do not primarily concern themselves with the Church of Rome or protest against it otherwise than by refusing to join it. All Western Christians, who remain outside the Roman Church, are in this sense Protestants.

Protestantism and Evangelicalism do not necessarily go together. But, granted that the term "Evangelical", like all our labels, is open to objection as question-begging or ambiguous, and even, if we apply it to ourselves, as a trifle arrogant, there ought to be certain broad distinguishing characteristics of Evangelicalism.

Some have suggested that Evangelicals stand for the mystical element in religion, the Modernists for the intellectual, and the Anglo- and Roman Catholics for the institutional. There is, of course, an element of truth in this. If by mysticism is meant personal religion, then Evangelicals do attach great importance to it, while those who are commonly called Modernists do attach great importance to the use of the mind, and Anglo-Catholics to the Church and Sacraments. But this account is superficial.

It is hardly true that Evangelicals attach more importance to personal religion than do Anglo- or Roman Catholics. The Oxford Movement was profoundly concerned with personal religion from the first, and this was no passing phase. The use of the Confessional by thousands and thousands of Catholics, the use of Retreats and Quiet Days, and their tremendous output of devotional literature of varying merit all witness to an intense concern with personal religion, while what interest exists in mysticism, properly so-called, is mainly Anglo-Catholic.

Again, whilst there have been great Modernist scholars, such as

Dr. Rashdall and Canon Streeter, and there are others still with us today, the contribution of Modernism to scholarship has been by no means outstanding. Dr. Wace, an ardent Evangelical of the Victorian era, perhaps did more to meet the scientific difficulties of his time than any other man. And, while it is true that the Evangelical movement in the Church of England has made comparatively little contribution to theology, and until recently has not appeared to be greatly interested in it, there are outstanding Nonconformist theologians in this country, who have provided for us the very marrow of a modern Evangelical divinity.

Nor is it true that Evangelicals have depreciated Church, Ministry or Sacraments. Such a symposium as that edited by Dr. A. J. Macdonald, *The Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion,* goes far to dispose of this myth, and it would be the grossest injustice to suggest that the great Nonconformist theologians of England, who are the best representatives of Evangelicalism amongst us, are individualists in religion. They are nothing of the kind.

It is equally vain to attempt to find the criterion of Evangelicalism in the central place which it gives to the Cross, for this emphasis it shares with the best Anglo-Catholic scholarship, preaching, and devotion.

Nor can we find the distinctive characteristic of Evangelicalism embodied in any particular credal symbol. It is rather in life than in creed that its essence is to be discovered.

Let us attempt to state the keynotes of the Evangelical tradition.

(1) Evangelicalism assigns a supreme place to the Bible. It emphasizes the centrality of the Bible. By the centrality of the Bible is not meant the private reading by Evangelicals of portions of Holy Scripture every day, for, quite plainly, Anglo-Catholics have a great deal of such Bible reading. That is not the same thing as having the Bible. Reading the Bible for edification, for our own private and personal needs, is of course quite necessary, but it is not distinctive of Evangelicals. The Evangelical goes to the Bible for his theology. Not that Evangelicalism is tied up with any theory of the plenary inspiration of Scripture with its consequent infallibility, a doctrine which is not now tenable—if indeed it ever was—and which never was the foundation of the Evangelical faith, and was characteristic of the seventeenth century rather than the Reformation era. Although Biblical scholarship is not the distinctive Evangelical contribution, Evangelicalism accepts with gratitude the work of the magnificent scholars of the Old and New Testaments.

The Evangelical has a Biblical theology, for him Holy Scripture is of unique value in the faith. What the Reformers did was to draw from Holy Scripture a certain scheme of faith and morals as the central and guaranteed stratum of revelation. They extracted

from Scripture a group of fundamental doctrines and used them as the regulative principle of the manifold and heterogeneous elements of Scripture. For the Evangelical, the Bible contains the Word of God. The Bible for the Evangelical contains God's holy word because there and there alone is set forth once for all the mighty acts of God in creation and redemption, the divine history upon which the Christian Church is founded and which all creeds and theologies set forth. Catholics commonly fail to understand what the Evangelical means by the Word of God, that Word which as Luther says has hands and feet. The Evangelical goes to the Bible not primarily for edification but to discover the purpose and thought of God. The function of Scripture is that, as the authoritative witness to the primal revelation, it provides the criterion by which all Christian discourse concerning God and divine things falls to be judged. Professor Dodd is in line with the Evangelical tradition when in the conclusion of his *The Apostolic Preaching* he warns us that while it is necessary to reinterpret for our own age the primitive *kerugma,* the attempt at reinterpretation is always in danger of becoming something quite different, *viz.* that which Paul called "preaching another Jesus and another Gospel", and suggests that all re-statement of the Gospel must be true to its first intention[1].

If Evangelicalism has always been passionately missionary, it is because Evangelicalism has always had a Biblical theology. What Denney said years ago is still true:

> It is not interest in missions that we want in our churches . . . but interest in the Gospel. Apart from a new interest in the Gospel, I believe we shall look in vain for a response to missionary appeals[2].

As P. T. Forsyth pointed out, Modern Protestant missions began at the close of the eighteenth century, a century dominated by philosophers, by scientists, by a reasonable moderate interpretation of religion, by broad humanitarian religion. But it was not amongst these broad people that missions arose. The Christian movement, which spread round the world, did not arise out of the liberal thinkers or humanitarian philosophers of the day, who were its worst enemies, but from a little group of Particular Baptists. Their Calvinistic theology was by present standards somewhat narrow, but it was soaked in the Bible[3].

There is something in the Gospel itself as presented in Scripture that at once creates missionary interest because it has no proper correlative but the universe. "God was in Christ reconciling the world (i.e., the cosmos) unto Himself". It is the same thought that was in the mind of a missionary of modern times when, in explain-

[1] p. 185.
[2] *The Everlasting Gospel,* p. 297.
[3] *The Work of Christ,* p. 61.

ing her journeys into unevangelized regions, she said, "They have a right to know that Christ died for them". If there is little missionary interest among us it is because there is little Biblical interest.

(2) The second characteristic of Evangelicalism is a definite preaching for conversion. This is not to deny that Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics sometimes preach for conversion. Of course they do. But it is not unfair to say that when they do so preach the Evangelical Gospel for conversion, it is because they have caught that infection from Evangelicalism. It is an essential feature of the Evangelical tradition to preach for a here-and-now decision. Or rather not for decision; the real Evangelical does not preach for decision; he holds out the Gospel of grace for acceptance. The Evangelical tradition from St. Paul onwards has been: "here and now accept and believe the Gospel". The word "decision" is not a New Testament word. It puts the emphasis in the wrong place, it puts the emphasis on the human will. The most common mistake made by pseudo-Evangelicals is to confuse faith with will-power. They urge a person to decide for Christ, and as a result of the hetero-suggestion of the revival meeting or of auto-suggestion in his own closet to say:

I *do* believe
I *will* believe
That Jesus died for *me*.

This is a parody of the best Evangelical religion and preaching. What could be more preposterous than to suggest that we obtain forgiveness by believing that we have been forgiven, making fact rest upon faith, instead of faith upon fact? The right relationship is well expressed by that great scholar, the late Dr. Oman, when he wrote:

> The right beginning is not faith as an emotion concerned about itself, but faith as a trust relying upon God. Only as faith arises from an object which constrains belief is it truly faith, being by so much as it is of our own efforts the less faith. Faith is only the right beginning when it is directed to God's gracious relation to us and away from all question of our gracious relation to God[4].

Such is the emphasis of St. Paul's preaching. "God was in Christ reconciling (actually reconciling, finishing the work in Christ) . . . therefore . . . Be ye reconciled to God". St. Paul preached the finished work of Christ. He did not preach a gradual reconciliation, but something done once for all, which is the basis of every soul's reconcilement, not a mere invitation. Evangelical preaching calls men to enter upon that reconciled position, that new relation which already in virtue of Christ's Cross belongs to the race as a whole. Very suggestive is the phrase John Wesley uses, "I proclaimed

[4] *Grace and Personality*, p. 136.

the Love of Christ to sinners". "I offered Christ to the people". The Evangelical preacher believes in a here-and-now acceptance. It is said of Spurgeon that he never stood up to speak to his vast congregation without remembering that as he spoke, lives might be changed for ever. May we not ask whether much of the failure of our preaching is not due to our neglect to offer a free salvation here and now? John Wesley, who after all knew something about these things, said, "Until you press believers to accept full salvation *now*, you must not look for any revival". It is full salvation *now* that is the burden of the Gospel. The "hot gospellers" in many a humble mission, and back street, the men who preach at Holiness Conventions in gospel tents know and prove the truth of this.

It is easy to speak with contempt of "salvation in five minutes", and doubtless, in one sense, the phrase is open to criticism, yet a gospel which cannot be stated and grasped in five minutes is not what it professes to be.

The difference between the Catholic and Evangelical schemes of salvation lies here; it turns upon the meaning of the term "justification" of the sinner. For the Catholic this means primarily that the unjust being is made just, or sanctified; for the Evangelical that he is accepted as just or pardoned. The Evangelical stands for forgiveness on the sole condition of a heartfelt trust in the mercy of God. It proclaims the glad tidings that there is forgiveness for the sinner both now and hereafter, when he throws himself on the mercy of God, relying only on the merits of the Saviour, who made atonement for his sins and fulfilled all righteousness. "When one has regard to his own righteousness", says Calvin, "his pitiful cry is 'Oh wretched man that I am!' but he triumphs gloriously over death and all accusation when he flees to the righteousness which rests on the divine mercy alone". In Romanism and in some degree also in Anglo-Catholicism, the position of the believer is of one for whom everything remains somehow in a condition of suspense, since his standing with God depends upon the degree in which he has become just. Such a book as the late Dom Bernard Clements' *The Precepts of the Church,* shows that the writer is unhappy unless he can supplement the new life in Christ by ethical securities beforehand or legal restrictions afterwards. He thinks of conversion as conversion to the Church rather than to Christ.

The special glory and wonder of the Evangelical message of Divine Forgiveness is that God does receive back the returning prodigal as if he had never been in that far country where he has wasted his substance in riotous living. To demand moral guarantees from the sinner before he comes to Christ, or to impose legal restrictions on him after he has yielded to His appeal and received Him through faith, is to the Evangelical a dishonouring of the Saviour.

He is not unconcerned that the convert should be a Church member, but his primary concern is that the sinner should be brought to Christ, and he is content to trust the new life to its own resources.

The very heart of the Christian message for the Evangelical is that the truly penitent sinner is in the wonderful mercy of God, and not because of any works or merits of his own, past, present or foreseen, treated as if his dark past had never been.

(3) The third characteristic of the Evangelical is his conception of Assurance. The Evangelical believes that God does not intend us to be wistful all our days, but that the Christian should know that he is in Christ, and that, if that assurance is lacking, there is a defect in his Christianity. "Nothing", writes Denney, "is more characteristic of churches than their attitude to assurance and the place they give it in their preaching and in their systems of doctrine. Speaking broadly we may say that in the Romish Church it is regarded as essentially akin to presumption; in the Protestant churches it is a privilege or a duty; but in the New Testament it is a fact"[5]. Evangelicalism at its best is nowhere more true to the New Testament than here, and nothing is more important than a recovery of the doctrine of Assurance. The temper of uncertainty and suspense overhanging the religious life, which predominates in the Church of Rome and to some extent in the Church of England, is emphatically not true to the New Testament. The Roman Catholic position is essentially that the basis of our religious assurance is what Christ has made of us through the operations of His grace. In so doing it throws us back upon our own imperfect selves as the only ground of confidence, and withholds that sense of religious security which is a legitimate demand of the religious nature of man, though it may be added that where the emphasis falls on the external expression of religion as in the sacraments of Romanism, the need for "assurance" falls into the background. The doctrine may be expressed in different ways by Calvinist and Arminian, but essentially, since they build on the basis of the one finished work of Christ and the response of faith from the sinner that that work evokes, they are trying to say the same thing. As Toplady sings:

My name from the palms of His hands
  Eternity will not erase,
Engraved on his heart it remains
  In marks of indelible grace.
Yes, I to the end shall endure
  As sure as the earnest is given,
More blessed but not more secure
  Are the glorified spirits in heaven.

[5] *Death of Christ*, pp. 209 ff.

and Charles Wesley sings:

The witness in ourselves we have
And all its fruits we show

they but express the same truth in a different way, for, as Oman says, "as they directly draw near to God, Calvinist and Arminian ever tend to enter a larger world where their differences are reconciled"[6].

This Assurance is not a matter of feeling, if "feeling" is to be thought of as some swelling tide of emotion; it is the conviction that God by his Spirit implants in the heart of the penitent the certainty that all is forgiven. God, the Evangelical believes, wants us to be sure of His forgiveness and His Love and we ought to be sure. Such Assurance is, in the phrase of the early Methodists, the common privilege of all Christians; it is neither a presumption of the natural mind nor a delusion of the devil but a permanent element in the believer's life. The Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are children of God.

(4) The fourth feature that seems to characterize Evangelicalism is the priesthood of all believers. The conception of a mediatorial priesthood is ruled out for the Evangelical since in the matter of his justification the sinner needs no mediation save that of the heavenly High Priest, and when justified he obtains the full rights of a child of God including free access to His presence at all times in all places.

The grand achievement of the Reformation was the insistence on the priestly function of all God's children; it was the courageous protest that there were not two kinds of Christian life with two kinds of standards but that all can rise to "perfection's sacred height".

In spite of the fact that, as the Catholic dictionary affirms, the words "priest" and "priesthood" (*hiereus, hiereuma*) are never applied in the New Testament to the offices of the Christian ministry, the clergy of the Roman obedience assert for themselves a priesthood, mediatorial, exclusive, offering expiation. This conception of the ministry strikes at the root of the doctrine of the sole mediation of our great High Priest, and denies in effect the all-sufficiency of His atoning work. The burden of the ministry is great enough without being exaggerated to a burden that only One can bear.

By contrast, the Evangelical holds to the priestly ideas of the New Testament. He affirms the priesthood of each believer, and the collective priesthood of the whole Church. It is only a Church of true priests that can give the lie to a Church of false ones.

The positive value of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers has been that a large section of the membership of Evangelical Churches has reached a high level of Christian zeal and endeavour. In the Evangelical home the husband and father took very seriously

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

the position of priest in the family, and there have been innumerable Evangelical homes that have been effective agents of Christian training. Further, in Evangelicalism the laity have been given a real share in the government of the Church, and the work of the ordained ministry has been supplemented by the labours of a host of Sunday School teachers, district visitors, and other contributors to the life and work of the Christian congregation. But most of all it has meant that, when a man has found or been found of Christ, the Evangelical tradition turns him out to be a prophet and proclaim the Gospel. This is not to deny that Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics have in their midst lay people who preach the Gospel, but in Evangelicalism men and women are encouraged, and sent out after their conversion, and almost immediately after their conversion, to share what they have discovered of the grace of God.

This traditional emphasis has in the past built up independent men and women, men and women who knew where they stood as regards God's grace, men and women with a Biblical theology who could give chapter and verse for what they believed, who were in dead earnest to go out and proclaim conversion to individuals. That, without any question, has been the strength of Evangelicalism. It has not depended on a priest here and a priest there, it has sent out men and women to evangelize, to preach for Christ wherever they have gone.

Such are the keynotes of Evangelicalism. No one can reflect upon them without viewing with very great anxiety the future of the Evangelical Churches. The rôle of *laudator temporis acti* is unenviable, yet it must be admitted that there are disquietingly few young men and women growing up in the Evangelical tradition to take the place of these many older Evangelicals who have so long borne the burden and heat of the day. While we are prepared for Christian unity on matters where we can unite, the only union that matters is union in evangelical bonds, and that is more important than the mere club association of our existing denominations.

Evangelicalism has suffered much at the hands of its friends. All sorts of secondary things have been classed as Evangelicalism. Some have thought to uphold the great name of Evangelical by being as narrow as a knife blade, and have esteemed orthodox soundness above plain morality. Evangelicalism in the true sense is not a thing of petty externals, but of the inner spirit, a Biblical theology, a free offer of the grace of God, the sending out of the rank and file of believers to win others for Christ, the doctrine of an assurance that we are in Christ, and that because we are in Christ, we shall triumph with Him when the kingdoms of the world become His Kingdom.

REVIEWS

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

Paul Blanshard. *American Freedom and Catholic Power.* (Boston: Beacon Press. $3.50.)

Henry Bamford Parkes. *The American People.* (Eyre & Spottiswoode. 15s.)

Here are two books which deserve the attention of all British readers, and it is surprising that no enterprising publisher on this side has issued Mr. Blanshard's book, which "everybody" in America was reading last summer, when it reached its sixth printing in five months.

Mr. Blanshard's volume illustrates in itself the thesis he sets out to prove: the publication of its substance in articles in *The Nation* brought a tremendous Roman Catholic outcry, and Catholic power was sufficient to prevent advertisement of the book in some of America's most reputable papers. It is safe to say that most English readers will learn with surprise of the way in which the Catholic hierarchy in America interferes in medicine and nursing, the press and the cinema, the radio and science, as well as in education and politics. Mr. Blanshard—his book is documented from Catholic sources throughout—sees the abuse of power by an organization that is not only a church, but a state within a state, and a state above a state. This paragraph provides an excellent summary:

> "There is no doubt that the American Catholic hierarchy has entered the political arena, and that it is becoming more and more aggressive in extending the frontiers of Catholic authority into the fields of medicine, education and foreign policy. In the name of religion, the hierarchy fights birth control and divorce laws in all states. It tells Catholic doctors, nurses, judges, teachers and legislators what they can and cannot do in many of the controversial phases of their professional conduct. It segregates Catholic children from the rest of the community in a separate school system, and censors the cultural diet of these children. It uses the political power of some 26,000,000 official American Catholics to bring American foreign policy into line with Vatican temporal interests."

Professor Parkes had a difficult task in interpreting "the American people" in less than 350 pages, for he has to survey the history of three hundred years in which an ever-growing population—in background as well as in numbers—spread across a vast continent. That his book is not only readable but provocative is the measure of his success. It is provocative in its selection of facts, as well as in its treatment of them, and scores of times we have wanted to stop and argue.

Professor Parkes's wide knowledge and keen insight are buttressed by sound common sense. How many modern historians would profit by accepting this counsel:

> "History is about human beings, not merely about general trends; and if we concentrate on economic pressures and political ideologies, and forget the living individuals who responded to them, its ultimate meaning may elude us."

ALBERT PEEL.

Story of American Protestantism, by Dr. Andrew L. Drummond. (Oliver and Boyd, 30s.)

The multiplicity of sects in American Protestantism is a tiresome puzzle to the serious enquirer and an occasion for scorn to the cynic. The superficial are content to make the religious situation with its 256 denominations the excuse for another gibe at individualism run riot, and the proneness of the people of America to confuse stunts and movements. It is therefore a wise warning which Dr. Drummond includes in his preface that most of the weirder varieties of American sectarians were not native excrescences but importations from Europe. He adds that out of the total membership of the Churches only 3 per cent belong to 200 of the listed sections. Against the background of those healthy reminders as to the contemporary situation Dr. Drummond turns back the pages of history and tells the story of how the great sections of American Protestantism took root in the country, and of the contributions to its life which they have made. It is a fascinating story, as Dr. Drummond tells it, and one immediate impression is, that denominations whose names are familiar to us in Britain do not necessarily occupy the same place in the American scene as they do with us. How could it be otherwise, when, for example, Congregationalism in the Eastern States has a State Church background, and the Roman Catholic State of Maryland was founded on the basis of an enlightened toleration? As the story develops any idea of a State Church fades from view altogether, which gives to the religious life of the United States a distinctive, and perhaps one ought to say, a unique feature. Episcopalians having to continue in a situation where the political ties which bound their congregations to Britain and its monarchical system were broken—these factors and others akin to them give to the whole story a novelty and an element of surprise which holds the attention, and excites it. Dr. Drummond's narrative is vivid and well documented, which in itself is an unusual blend. His pen pictures of the chief actors are finely and arrestingly drawn. And throughout the whole story there is a refreshing objectivity, which gives the reader confidence that he is being given the real picture of events and tendencies. Dr. Drummond has placed us all in his debt for this book so scholarly, so full of insight, and so intensely interesting. Added to which it is a book which one will keep on the library shelves as invaluable for reference.

SIDNEY M. BERRY.

Christianity and Fear. (Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

In this book Dr. Oscar Pfister has given us out of his vast experience as a pastor and psycho-analyst a very comprehensive treatment of the subject. The book, which runs to nearly 600 pages, contains much that will be of practical help to the minister in dealing with those who are fear-ridden, but it is by no means a manual of pastoral psychology. The first part sets forth the theory of fear in the individual and the mob. Some readers may find the terms a little confusing at first (though this is presumably due to the translator rather than the author), for "dread" is used where we should expect to read "fear", and "fear" where "anxiety" would be more usual. The second part is historical and, after discussing Jesus and Paul, Dr. Pfister passes on to the part played by fear and its alleviation in Catholicism, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, the Post-Reformist age and the Enlightenment. The concluding part deals with the solution of the problem of fear through Christianity. The author's view is that "the two chief causes of fear are an interference with the impulse towards love in general and a sense of guilt (a special form of this interference) in particular."

(p. 52). Jesus, as the teacher and embodiment of love is, therefore, the great Saviour from fear, but the victim of fear sometimes needs psychiatric help before love can do its work—"The teaching of Jesus, wholly centred as it is on love, can find an entrance only where the capacity for love has not been diverted or weakened excessively by neurotic influences." (p. 530). The book demands much more than a casual reading and will repay study.

L. J. Tizard.

These Also Believe, by C. S. Braden. (Macmillan, 45s.)

Professor Braden has written a sympathetic and fascinating account of a number of modern American cults and minority religious movements. The book is based on first-hand information, and will undoubtedly become a standard work of reference on its subject. Amongst the movements described are Father Divine's Peace Mission, New Thought, Christian Science, Jehovah's Witnesses, the Oxford Group Movement and Mormonism. The Professor maintains that all such movements have real value in that they meet the religious needs of many people who find no help in the major Christian churches. But one wonders whether he has proposed an adequate test of value; need can be met in many ways, and not all are equally good. The Israelite refugees in Egypt thought that their religious wants were best met by the worship of Ashtoreth, the "queen of heaven"; but the prophet Jeremiah did not find the plea an adequate defence of their idolatry. Nor can the same plea justify the really idolatrous worship of the coloured man, Father Divine, related by Professor Braden. Some of the cults described are certainly on a very different level from this worship; but the point remains that discrimination among them must proceed on other principles than a mere reference to human need.

Robert S. Franks.

Beyond Realism and Idealism, by W. M. Urban. (Allen & Unwin, 18s.)

The theme of this book may be stated as follows. Realism and Idealism both rest ultimately upon a moral faith; the one believes the independence of the object with reference to mind to be essential to knowledge, and the other equally believes in its intelligibility as that without which there could be no knowledge of it. Both Realism and Idealism are right in their beliefs; but this rightness can only be seen, if the belief can be synthesized. This can be done by relating both to the first principle of the Good, which equally demands loyalty to the Ideal and respect for the object to be acted on. Realism and Idealism simply translate this synthesis into the language of Epistemology.

This reduction of the issue between Realism and Idealism to the principle of moral action involves a further point: that the Ideal being realizable in the Universe, must find in the universe an affinity with itself; otherwise it would be no more than a mirage of human illusion. Thus we reach a view in which cosmic reality is dominated by the Ideal of the Good; in other words we have a teleological view of the universe, within which moral action, involving the epistemological synthesis of Idealism and Realism, can function. Professor Urban contends that this world-view expresses the essential drift of European philosophy: it is the true *philosophia perennis*.

The above thesis is, of course, not new: Professor Urban simply repeats in his own way the position of Kant as interpreted by Fichte. It would indeed be a fault if the thesis were new, since it is claimed that it represents the true line of European philosophy. The merit of the book is in the way in which it is attempted to prove this claim. The proof takes the form

of a critical review of the history of philosophy in France, Britain, Germany and America, in which special attention is paid to the philosophy and philosophers of the last fifty years. The review is brilliant, exhaustive and most instructive. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Christianity and the Modern World View, by H. A. Hodges. (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.)

Beyond Belief, by L. E. Jones. (Secker & Warburg, 5s.)

Each of these books is in its own way a sign of the religious unsettlement of the times. Professor Hodges is concerned with the present domination of modern thought by science, and the challenge that this presents to Christianity. The author of "Beyond Belief" is mainly occupied with the results of historical criticism as contrasted with the dogma of the Church of England.

Professor Hodges points out that any total view of the universe is based upon the acceptance of a presupposition which itself cannot be proved; all that can be done is to show that it leads to a coherent scheme which takes everything into its scope. The presupposition from which modern science starts is that of the uniformity of nature as governed by the Law of Causality; over against this stands the religious presupposition which traces everything back to God; between the two is the metaphysical presupposition which may be described as a depersonalization of the presupposition of Religion. Only the religious presupposition can sufficiently explain the universe in the truest sense.

What then does the recognition of this presupposition involve? There is one supreme difficulty in the way of its acceptance: the problem of the evil in the world. Unquestionably the problem is intensified by the acceptance of a theistic philosophy, yet Theism does more to meet it than any other explanation of the world, since it shows God revealing Himself redemptively to meet this very difficulty: it is here that it reaches its fullest development in the form of Christianity.

There is, however, another side to the matter. In spite of all theoretical superiority to other principles of world-explanation, the religious presupposition is peculiarly difficult for man to accept, since it requires him to turn his back on his own natural instincts and to live in obedience to God. To do so is in fact impossible apart from the Divine help, which Christianity calls grace. But even when grace does enable man, it is to be recognized that he is living in a paradox: Christianity is in fact a religion which turns the world upside down.

Such is the argument of Professor Hodges. Let us now consider "Beyond Belief." It is maintained that the traditional dogma can be accepted by no modern-thinking man, even though it is sponsored by good men. The origin of Christian dogma is traced to the Apostle Paul, who in his Gentile mission disastrously replaced the historical human Jesus by the Divine Christ as the Redeemer from sin. The only hope for religion today is to return to Jesus, who in spite of his Apocalypticism was the prophet of a true humanity, proclaiming the oneness of the human spirit with the Absolute Spirit. When he bade men love God and love one another, what he really meant was that they were to love goodness, and so all men would become lovable.

In considering the two books it will be best to take "Beyond Belief" first. It is to be freely admitted that a retranslation into modern terminology is urgently required. But the result of such work, if done with sufficient care, will be quite different from the suggestions of "Beyond Belief." It

will be much more like the theology of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, to the study of which masters Christian thinkers would do well to return from the present obsession with Kierkegaard and Barth.

Saying this, I come back to Professor Hodges, who seems to me to concede too much to this latest fashion, when he concludes with the thought of religion as a paradox. One may admire the logical cogency with which his scheme is worked out, and yet one may regret that his book should end just where it does. A paradox can never be a place to rest in, but is only a halt on the way to a further explanation. Professor Hodges himself suggests the way out of the paradox in one place where he speaks of metaphysics as a bridge between science and religion. He thinks of it indeed only subjectively as a stage of thought to be passed through. But a more persistent pursuance of his idea might reveal metaphysic as possessed of objective value, and as the likeliest healer of the open breach with which he leaves us.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Divine and the Human, by Nicholas Berdyaev (translated by R. M. French). (Bles, 18s.)

There are some thinkers who are remarkable for their sound and balanced views, while others, whose systematic power is not great, have a great power of stimulation. Berdyaev belongs to this second class. His colleague Fr. Bulgakov was, in my judgment, the greater thinker, but of the immense and almost unequalled stimulating power of Berdyaev there is no doubt. This book is as good a sample of, and as good an introduction to him, as anyone could want. If any reader has to give an address on either Fear, Suffering, Evil, War, Manhood, Spirituality, Beauty, or Immortality, they will find in this book a powerful stimulus to bring what they think into vivid life.

Berdyaev's thesis in this, as in everything he wrote, is the divine-human relationship. Here he has the important suggestion that Christian anthropology needs to take with revolutionary seriousness the fact of human creativity. Behind Berdyaev there is always the Orthodox Liturgy. This needs to be recognized—for there may be many, who would accept his almost savage attacks on historical Christianity, who would not accept the basis on which he made them—that eschatological Christianity which he believed was destined to come after the crucifixion of man and of the world now taking place. The greatness of Berdyaev lies in his insistence that the experience of the present time is essentially part of the Christian revelation, and also in his confident hope which looks beyond the upheaval of the present to the "transformation of the whole creation in the Holy Spirit."

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Notes Towards the Definition of Culture. T. S. Eliot. (Faber, 10s. 6d.)

Christianity and Civilization. II Part. Specific Problems. Emil Brunner. (Nisbet, 10s.)

My Philosophy. Benedetto Croce. (Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

Decadence. C. E. M. Joad. (Faber, 12s. 6d.)

In one way and another all these books are concerned with the cultural crisis with which history confronts us today.

Mr. Eliot, an Anglican Catholic conservative, has given us an acutely critical examination of the word culture, which can apply, he says, to individuals, to a group or class, or to a whole society. He argues that every culture that has so far appeared in history has appeared with its own religion, which he regards as the root of culture. The two things affect each

other, for the religion of a people may well come to be an instrument of criticism or reformation of culture, but it can just as well find itself identified with the whole way of life of the people. There is a very searching examination of the notion of government by an élite, a chapter which should be read and pondered by all who in any way incline to believe in a government by specialists. Mr. Eliot has given a salutary warning that such a government may be the end of culture. He has some equally searching things to say about the appearance of different churches, though here he has some fundamental misconceptions of what Protestantism means: "the life of Protestantism depends upon the survival of that against which it protests; and . . . the culture of Protestant dissent would perish of inanition without the persistence of Anglican culture." Protestantism as we know is not the shouting of a negative but is basically an affirmation independent of the Catholic, and from the beginning it has claimed to be a full proclamation in the whole of human life of the fundamental Christian Gospel. Mr. Eliot, for all his acute analysis, is temperamentally and socially unable to contemplate the possibility of the death of a culture, which for him is the culture that has flourished here in Britain for the past 100 years. This book is arm-chair, Galsworthian balcony thinking. It is unable to do more than contemplate the struggle which goes on outside its own security. In the end the charge against Mr. Eliot must be that in thinking of the death of culture as tantamount to the end of all things, he has in fact substituted class thinking for objective thinking and Christian judgment. The real world is one where not only must we run risks of destroying culture, but where in fact cultures die and are born. Mr. Eliot has no word to say about this. A true Christian philosopher, in categories of suffering, death and resurrection, can speak in the contemporary world an even more searching and disturbing message than Mr. Eliot has been able to give us.

Dr. Brunner in these lectures attempts to apply the principles of his previous volume to a number of particular problems in the field of culture, e.g. technics, science, education, work, art, wealth, power. The book is full of fruitful and suggestive insights but it seems to suffer from a Communist phobia, which, however justifiable, hinders clear thinking on some important subjects. But I am not convinced that even Dr. Brunner has penetrated to the heart of the present situation. He concludes that technics is no problem for the Christian man since technics is neutral. The question it raises is whether the human wills which use it are obedient to to the divine will or not. He then seriously questions whether our technical progress has not already passed the limits of human control, and concludes that the only important question is "whether mankind is ready or may become ready to perform that inward right-about-turn which alone will correct the fatal perversion of the order of means and end." Now it would seem that this leaves the problem at the very point of diagnosis. The Christian cannot match individual conversion against dynamic development of mass production. If all the world were Christian we should still have to deal with the dynamic and demonic nature of technics. Universal conversion would provide a better environment for the solution of the problem, but would not itself be a solution and it may well be that it is not a necessary environment for discovering a solution. This book is much more satisfying than Mr. Eliot's, though it has failed to envisage the depth of the tragedy in which the conflicts of Christ and man place the contemporary world.

Mr. Carritt has done Englishmen a service by translating a selection of Croce's essays on the moral and political problems of our time. The essays

cover a wide range including philosophy, politics, ethics, aesthetics and the philosophy of history. Croce requests us not to classify him as Hegelian. Others will find that more difficult than Croce but in essence I think his point is right, for what he has done in the history of thought is to see certain principles which were enunciated by Hegel and develop and apply them in new ways. It is a remarkable thing that out of Hegelism should have come the basic philosophies of Marx, the Communist, to some extent of Mussolini and Hitler, the Fascists, and of Benedetto Croce, the Liberal. It is clear that what Croce has done is quite new; and for a refreshing defence of individualism and freedom and liberalism no better book could be imagined than this volume. For Croce, as for Hegel, philosophy is the history of philosophy. We have to distinguish real history from anecdotal or chronological history; and real history consists in bringing the particularities of any historical situation under the ideas which they illustrate and which alone give them meaning. The early Croce could hardly be said to have given us a Christian philosophy, but he includes in this volume an essay on why we cannot help calling ourselves Christians, though to do this he has to cut loose from the particularities of the Christian revelation (the events of our Lord's life and death) in history, and offer us as substitutes certain logical ideas. But while this explicit confession of faith may be sincere it would seem still to be inconsistent with his principles. For if the Christian church is any judge of what it is to be a Christian, it is required that a Christian should be ready to affirm the particularities of history. Moreover in the treatment of Providence we have an essay which shows how little Croce's philosophy can articulate Christian faith, for Croce refuses to acknowledge the being of a personal God directing history to His own purposes. The explanation is still offered in terms of an impersonal, logical, absolute idea.

Mr. Joad has conducted a philosophical enquiry into what he calls decadence, a word which will not suggest to the prospective purchaser the theme or the treatment of an interesting but limited book. This is Mr. Joad's writing at its best, though he is as verbose and as confident as ever. The main contention of the book is that there is a fundamental fallacy common to all kinds of people, namely that of "denying the object." This attitude could be formulated in the statement that experience is something that can be valued for its own sake "irrespective of the quality or kind of the experience", and it finds its expression "in the appropriate beliefs about life, morals, art and society which entail and are entailed by this view, together with the scales of values and modes of taste associated with these beliefs." With this fundamental thesis the Christian philosopher must be in wholehearted agreement and it is a very useful thing to have the case pleaded by so popular and so acute a philosopher as Mr. Joad. But while Mr. Joad has got hold of an important and perhaps fundamental truth, there are other fundamental conceptions at the root of our present distresses which he has not treated of in this work. What we have said about Mr. Eliot would apply also to Mr. Joad, that he lacks categories for dealing with the profoundly tragic elements in human history and culture.

JOHN MARSH.

The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, by J. Jocz. (S.P.C.K., 21s.)

Galen on Jews and Christians, by R. Walzer. (O.U.P., 10s. 6d.)

The Wisdom of Israel, by Lewis Browne. (Michael Joseph, 12s. 6d.)

The first two of these books, though very different, are valuable contributions to our understanding of Jewish-Christian relationships. Dr. Jocz

surveys the whole field from N.T. times to the present. Beginning with the Jewish scene into which Jesus came, he passes on to the mutual reactions of Judaism and Christianity, and outlines the history of Hebrew Christianity. The study leads to the essential Theological and 'Nationalist' issue which separates the Church and the Synagogue, and, while there are many points which demand modification, the central contention is sound that it is in the Person of Christ that Church and Synagogue both meet and must separate. This passionate book is a penetrating contribution to the Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Mr. Walzer's book is as concentrated in its interest as that of Dr. Jocz is comprehensive: it is a meticulous study of all Galen's reference to Jews and Christians, which, despite his prolific output, are only six in number. The monograph is a model of its kind in its arrangement and scholarship, and affords a fascinating sidelight on the relations of thoughtful Christians and Jews in a period which was of crucial significance for both. It reveals the importance of Arabic literature for the history of philosophy and religion in the early centuries of our era.

The third book is an anthology of the 'wisdom' of Israel through the centuries. Taking the "Wisdom of Literature" of the Old Testament as the norm for the meaning of 'wisdom' for Israel, it excludes passages that are mystical, sectarian and merely learned. Similarly it defines 'Israel' as a 'cultural tradition', hence the works of Jews who are such merely by birth, like Marx, are excluded because they are not "steeped in Israel's spirit". The result is a highly interesting and comprehensive anthology, despite the omissions dictated by the above criteria. The brief notes on people and sources quoted are very good. W. D. DAVIES.

The Church in the Christian Roman Empire, by J. R. Palanque, G. Bardy and P. de Labriolle. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger, Ph.D. (Burns, Oates, 25s.)

This is the fifth volume of Dr. Messenger's translation of the great French *Histoire de l'Eglise,* which is being produced under the general editorship of Fliche and Martin. The first four volumes, issued under the English title *The History of the Primitive Church,* covered from New Testament times until Constantine. The present volume is the first of four designed to cover the period from Constantine to Charlemagne, and itself devotes 408 pages to the years 311 to 384 A.D. We thus have before us a work on an ambitious scale; but it is neither diffuse nor merely encyclopaedic. It is well written, well arranged, and adequately but not excessively documented.

The whole work is engaging many writers, and the present volume has occupied three. This composite authorship has advantages: each topic and period has the attention of an expert who is not overwhelmed by the magnitude of the total task; but an inevitable disadvantage is a certain disproportion both in method and scale. Nevertheless, the work displays a general unity which bespeaks admirable collaboration amongst those concerned, and the fact of composite authorship is never obtrusive.

This volume deals with Constantine, Donatism, the rise of Arianism; the Council of Nicaea and its aftermath; Julian and the pagan reaction; the divisions and decline of Arianism; and the triumph of orthodoxy at the Council of Constantinople. Other matters and personalities are dealt with in the course of the main stream of the narrative, Basil of Caesarea, for example, receiving twenty pages. The general arrangement is better, I would say, than that of the preceding volumes.

As to point of view, the work is characterized by objectivity, realistic insight, and freedom from bias. In doubtful matters the various points of view are stated, with full references, and the writer's opinion is set against a factual background. This treatment is particularly to be appreciated in such matters as the correctitude of speaking of an "Edict of Milan", in the questions arising from the conversion and character of Constantine, and in the true assessment of Julian the Apostate. The writers are all Roman Catholics; but I doubt whether this could be detected from internal evidence. The bibliography, for instance, lists not only Mourret, but Kidd; not only Tixeront, but Seeberg; and the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* as well as the *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*. We note with satisfaction a tendency in recent years for Roman Catholic writers to take fuller account of the work done by scholars outside their own communion.

This book does not read like a translation, which is perhaps the greatest praise. The English style is easy, the typography is good, and the proofs have been corrected with exemplary care.

In conclusion, it may be said that this volume deals adequately and interestingly with a very important period of Church History, and should appeal to the general reader as well as to the specialist.

AUBREY R. VINE.

Tertullian's Treatise Againt Praxeas. The Text edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 21s.)

Praxeas came to Rome from Asia Minor with the reputation of a confessor and dissuaded the bishop from leniency toward Montanism. That was bad enough in the judgment of Tertullian; but worse, he introduced heresy by not properly distinguishing Christ from God the Father: "he managed two jobs for the Devil: he expelled prophecy and introduced heresy, he drove away the Paraclete and crucified the Father". That is all the information we have about Praxeas himself, but his teaching had many representatives in the early centuries. Any refutation of it is bound to have relevance to Christological discussion, and that is the importance of the scholarly volume before us, although Tertullian's argument is far removed from the humanistic presentations of Christ which have bulked so large in modern Christologies.

The treatise consists almost entirely of discussion of Biblical texts. That is a large part of its value, for it means that we are not lost in abstractions and logical subtleties. But a definition of the relationship of Christ to God needs to go beyond the province of exegesis. Tertullian meets this obligation by his use of terms like substantia, status, persona; or by careful contrast of such words as *divisio* and *distinctio*, *unare* and *unire*. Dr. Evans is of great help here, both in the notes on the text and in the section of the introduction on Tertullian's theological terminology; and many will find this the chief value of his book. It is perhaps regrettable that he has not felt the need to re-interpret those Latin terms which Tertullian made classic; for their relevance, or lack of relevance, to modern consideration of the same problem should be indicated.

Tertullian's Latin is difficult, but Dr. Evans gives all the help a serious student needs. The translation is clear without being excessively literal, and ambiguous points are always explained in the notes, which are very full, perhaps over-full in respect of references to the Fathers. They are, however, admirable both philologically and theologically, and provide a most useful introduction to Tertullian's style and thought.

E. C. BLACKMAN.

The Planting of Christianity in Africa, by C. P. Groves. (Lutterworth Press, 21s.)

This is the first volume of what is designed to be a comprehensive history of Christian missionary enterprise in Africa. Here the story is carried from earliest times to the coming of Livingstone. Much attention is now being given to Africa for many reasons. Whether its history in the next hundred years will rival America's in the last, or whether past disappointments will be repeated, remains to be seen. But whatever happens it cannot be ignored, nor ever again can the people be divorced from the land. Those who would use the natural resources of Africa must come to terms with its people. Repression is not enough. This book therefore meets a need, for while parts of the story of Christianity in Africa are well known, this is the first attempt to bring the whole story into focus.

After a preliminary account of the topography, which explains much of the history of the continent whose vast central plateau, though drained by great rivers, descends to the coastal plains so abruptly as to make navigation into the interior impossible, and whose northern Mediterranean area is cut off from the rest of the continent by the Sahara, the story begins in the Apostolic age and continues with the Church in Egypt and the north. This church was overwhelmed by the rise of Islam which has remained dominant for centuries. The grim story of the slave trade is followed by the attack upon it and with the 19th century come the missionary societies to begin their work in the South and West. It is a tremendous story that Prof. Groves has to tell. Two great Christian cultures have disappeared. What will be the fate of the third effort? There are deep shadows, but there are high lights. The need is for the faith that removes mountains. Europe and America have done great hurt to this continent. Shall we be allowed to pay our debts? J. Mills Phillips.

The Middle Ages in the West, by Sir Henry Slesser. (Hutchinson, 21s.)

The theme of this book is that in these days when the sovereign national State seems to have reached its term we shall find more guidance for the future in the Middle Ages than in anything that has happened since. This thesis, of course, has the additional fascination to the Roman convert like Sir Henry Slesser in that it provides an oblique criticism of the Reformation as the cause for our present discontents. The book is therefore a somewhat naive tract for the times rather than a scholarly history, and the level of its critical acumen may be indicated by this sentence about Anselm: "His works being more orthodox in spirit, were less commented upon by later Scholasticism than those of the contentious Abelard, but today Anselm is much admired by many both within and outside the Catholic Church". It will, however, be a useful compendium for middle and upper forms of schools, for whom it appears to have been written, and in the hands of a good teacher will be a useful text-book. The author has dealt with all sides of mediaeval life—law, philosophy, art and science, as well as with politics and social structure, and if he accords to the "age of faith" rather more credit than the evidence will bear there is no harm in allowing for the bias of an enthusiastic convert. What is missing, however, is a recognition that the real residuary legatee of mediaeval totalitarian theory is modern Russian Communism, which possesses precisely that effective control over all sides of life which the Popes have always desired but have never been able to achieve. A. Victor Murray.

Cosmo Gordon Lang, by J. G. Lockhart. (Hodder & Stoughton, 25s.)

Mr. Lockhart does not attempt to make Lang appear as a great man, and he has not written a great book; but Lang was undoubtedly a very interesting person, and this is a frank and absorbing biography. It is primarily a study of Great Place; for it was on this that Lang was set from the beginning, and he won it early, at 44 stepping straight from Stepney to York. "You are too meteoric for precedent", wrote Hensley Henson. But "the very rapidity of Lang's rise . . . worked against him. He had come to York too soon and was to go to Canterbury too late". And at Canterbury, on the great issues, he "did little more than mark time".

"His will was fixed on success": "his intention to climb to the top of the ladder was too plain even to be questioned". This would have hindered less, spiritually, had Saul become Paul; but did he? After a "half-intellectual, half-spiritual 'conversion'" as a boy (his own inverted commas), Lang retained "a strong *intellectual* belief in the main Christian doctrines" (his own italics); but, when, as he was about to be called to the Bar, the Diviner call came to him, as he believed, "to be ordained", he was as yet neither confirmed in the Church of England nor actively associated with any other communion or local church. When Scott Holland "mentioned 'a love of souls', I could not understand his language"; small wonder that Holland (at first) was "dubious of his vocation". Yet a private confirmation, by a bishop who did not know him, was followed by a single year only at Cuddesdon, "where he was deferentially received by the Principal" and "was not expected to attend lectures", and where "some of his fellow-students stood somewhat in awe of him".

There were the seeds here for what followed—for the double tragedy (if that is not too strong a word) of the man who in one sense is always watching his step and in another sense takes good care that others are watching him too. "I wish I had some of the qualities of the fanatic, who is always prepared to 'damn the consequences'." This is exactly what one misses in him. One longs, and looks in vain, for the single-minded committedness of a man like Gore, whose message on Lang's translation to Canterbury was "the only word of so many in those countless letters that went like an arrow to his conscience, 'Keep loyal above all things to Jesus of Nazareth'." This is a moving story, faithfully told; and it is tastefully illustrated and well indexed and printed. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

Readers of these pages have long since learned to value Mr. P. A. Spalding's critical judgment but have hardly been prepared for the humour which enlivens his "'Study of Diaries and the Diarist'', *Self-Harvest* (Independent Press, 6s.). Though slight, this is an eminently serious work: "To be alive at all—that is the admirable and curious thing'': "Diary-writing in its purest form springs from the instinct to save life. The best expression of this is Boswell's image of the growing corn. ' . . . There is a waste of good if it (experience) be not preserved'.'' The fun comes in in the snippets quoted to illustrate the deftly-presented argument; and these have the full-creaminess of years of straining. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

A History of the Next Hundred Years—Unless, by Mr. Hamilton Fyfe (Allen & Unwin; Paper, 3s. 6d.) is an outline of the shape of things to come after the managerial revolution, when Capitalism and Communism have been succeeded by technological government. The rulers of the future will have 'neither time nor inclination for politics on the old lines. The masses being kept at work no more than six hours a day, provided with occupations and amusements for their leisure, sufficiently well housed, clothed and fed were contented'. This is the new heaven—hell—that awaits our grandchildren. Sufficient unto the day.

God's Grace and Man's Hope, by Dr. Daniel Day Williams (Harpers, 15s.) is a valuable contribution to the debate between the 'liberal' theology, which underrated man's dire situation, and 'neo-orthodoxy' which does less than justice to the compassion of God. Dr. Williams finds much of value in both schools and here attempts their reconciliation in a better understanding of the place of love in theology. Christ is the incarnation of the Logos, yet this is a world in which Christ is crucified. The grace of God is no simple solution to the plight of man. The Christian faith does not offer utilitarian solutions. It offers new life and power and faith. It can guide moral effort and sustain the exercise of social intelligence while it strengthens our hold upon the reality of God's judgment and mercy. This is an important as well as a beautifully written book, rich in suggestion and revealing the spirit it commends.

Education in the Forces, 1939-46, by Mr. N. Scarlyn Wilson (Evans Bros., Paper, 7s. 6d.) is a survey of the remarkable effort in adult education carried on throughout the war by civilian lecturers organized by the Central Advisory Council through its Regional Committees associated with the Universities. 'It is a record', says Sir Walter Moberly in his foreword, 'of civilian and military co-operation which would have been out of the question in any other nation in arms than ours'. Its inspiration was a concern for a whole generation of young men taken away from the interests and protections of civil life, and a desire to expound and justify the democratic way of life for which they were fighting. Lecturers went as far afield as India: others visited isolated guard units in remote railway sidings. Groups of a dozen and audiences of 1,000 were kept in touch with the world they had left by lectures on subjects which ranged from housewifery to musical appreciation and world politics.

Evidence For Voluntary Action, edited by Lord Beveridge and Mr. A. F.

Wells (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) offers to students and interested readers much of the material from whch Lord Beveridge drew the outline and general conclusions of his recently-published *Voluntary Action*. Here are the reports by Mass Observation and Research Services with memoranda by voluntary organizations and individual experts on special subjects, lists of social service agencies and a bibliography of voluntary action. This book is not only a companion and guide to the earlier invaluable work but is itself a storehouse of sociological data which all workers in this field will find indispensable.

Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind, by P. T. Forsyth (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.) needs no commendation to those of his own generation who have long been searching the secondhand bookshops for anything of Forsyth's. Younger preachers must not miss it. It will restore their dignity, sharpen their intellect and deepen their devotion. It is even more challenging today than when it first appeared. Some of Forsyth's fears have not proved liars. His urgency was not misplaced. "Catholicism is the Christianity of the natural man. It is easy on human nature. . . . If the preacher is belittled, the priest is enhanced. . . . Whenever the Church is preached the Gospel comes short. . . . Preaching is the Church confessing its faith. . . . A Christianity of short sermons is a Christianity of short fibre". Take and read. J. Mills Phillips.

One might expect a history of English literature in 190 small pages to be little more than a list of well-known names and titles. But Professor B. Ifor Evans' *A Short History of English Literature* (Staples, 7s. 6d.)—first published in the *Pelican* Series in 1940—is much more than this, and should appeal to the specialist no less than to the novice. Professor Evans gives one chapter to literature before the Conquest, four chapters to poetry from Chaucer to Yeats, three to the drama, three to the novel and two to prose other than fiction. Not all his judgments are conventional. Some readers may think, for instance, that he overestimates Goldsmith. Shakespeare certainly possessed some Christian virtues, but was he, in any definite sense of the word, a Christian?

By contrast, the 514 large pages of the third volume of Professor Hoxie Neale Fairchild's *Religious Trends in English Poetry* (Columbia University Press, London: Cumberlege, 35s.) cover only 50 years (1780-1830). Previous volumes dealt with the religious beliefs of nearly 400 18th-century poets, but volume III is devoted almost entirely to what the author calls "spiritual biographies" of the seven chief romantic poets—Burns, Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Byron, and Keats. Obviously some poets (Coleridge and Wordsworth) are more amenable to this treatment than others (Burns and Keats), but Professor Fairchild's book is important as an analysis of romantic heresies, and particularly of individualism in poetry, rather than as a study of individual poets. A fourth volume (1830-80) of this monumental work is promised in "seven or eight years".

In *Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition* (Princeton University Press, London: Cumberlege, 21s.) Professor F. M. Krouse argues that Milton's critics have too often commented upon the most puzzling of his poems as if it were a 19th or 20th century work. Why did Milton choose this subject for his last poem? Is its inspiration primarily Greek or Hebraic? How far is it allegorical? Such questions can only be answered, Professor Krouse believes, if we remember how much "Samson noster" meant to the 17th century, and how ancient and complex was the tradition associated with

his name. Accordingly, he resurrects this dead tradition, tracing its growth from pre-Christian times to the Renaissance, and in a final chapter discusses its relevance to Milton's tragedy. This is an illuminating essay, particularly to those more familiar with Milton than with his period.

Mr. George Newton Conklin's *Biblical Criticism and Heresy in Milton* (King's Crown Press, London: Cumberlege, 14s.) examines the philological aspects of Milton's exegesis in his *De Doctrina Christiana,* and seeks to show that his heretical opinions were derived rather from his method of Biblical criticism than from patristic, Renaissance or rabbinical sources. Since Milton himself declared that his treatise was "Compiled from the Holy Scriptures Alone", this amounts to proving, somewhat elaborately, that he spoke the truth. An introductory chapter summarizes the main features of Renaissance Biblical scholarship.

Who has given "more pleasure to more people than anybody else in history"? According to Mr. Hesketh Pearson the answer to this question is Charles Dickens, and in *Dickens: His Character, Comedy and Career* (Methuen, 18s.), a biography more readable than most novels, he goes far to justify this claim. Relegating the author to second place, Mr. Pearson gives a vivid picture of the man, with his immense zest for living, his demonic energy, his irrepressible cheerfulness, his love of fame, of people, of practical jokes and of acting, whether on the stage or off it. But Mr. Pearson's enthusiasm for his hero sometimes carries him too far. It is surely possible to praise Dickens without denigrating Carlyle.

W. E. Henley (1849-1903), poet and essayist, friend of R. L. Stevenson and sponsor of, among others, the young Yeats and Kipling, has never received from critics the attention he deserves. All the more welcome, therefore, is Mr. John Connell's *W. E. Henley* (Constable, 21s.), a well-documented, sympathetic, even inspiring study of a great editor and a courageous man. Mr. Connell begins by drawing an interesting parallel between Henley and Dr. Johnson. As a biographer he himself may as fairly be compared with Boswell.

Mr. Arthur C. Turner's biography of the first Lord Tweedsmuir, *Mr. Buchan, Writer* (S.C.M., 5s.), briefly outlines the career of a son of the manse who became equally famous as man of action and as man of letters. Few men have been so immediately and so variously successful. While still at Oxford the future Governor-General of Canada was already an established author with a unique entry ("Buchan, John, undergraduate . . .") in *Who's Who*. But Mr. Turner's book is frankly a tribute, rather than a critical study.

J. E. K. Aggrey, who was born at Anamabu on the Gold Coast in 1875 and died in New York in 1927, has been called "the finest interpreter which the present century has produced of the white man to the black, or the black man to the white". In *Dr. Aggrey* (S.C.M., 5s.), Mr. W. M. Macartney gives a short but adequate account of the career and continuing influence of the man whom he considers to have been the greatest African since St. Augustine.

Under the title *A Religious Rebel* (Nisbet, 10s. 6d.), the letters of Hannah Whitall Smith (once famous as the author of the best-selling *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*) have been edited by her son, Logan Pearsall Smith, with a preface and memoir by Mr. Robert Gathorne-Hardy. The letters, which begin in Philadelphia in 1847 and end at Iffley in 1911, give an entertaining picture not only of the writer and her talented family, but

also of Quaker society in America and of aristocratic Evangelicals in England.

In *The Healing Touch* (Cape, 15s.) Dr. Harley Williams describes the careers, and, in non-technical language, the achievements, of a number of eminent medical men from Sir William Knighton, physician to George the Fourth, to Harvey Cushing, the American brain surgeon, and one woman, Florence Nightingale. Of particular interest are the chapters which concern the Mayo brothers and their famous Clinic at Rochester, Minnesota. Though somewhat long-winded, the book is pleasingly written and well illustrated.

As one of the founders of the Rationalist Press Association and its present Literary Adviser, Mr. A. Gowans Whyte was well qualified to write *The Story of the R.P.A.* (Watts, 5s.). Particularly interesting is his account of the Association's original sixpenny reprints. Appearing as early as 1902, these were the first cheap editions of good books, other than novels. The book includes a list of the Association's officers and honorary associates from its beginning in 1899.

All the poems in the Poet Laureate's new collection, *On the Hill* (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.), are published for the first time. Outstanding among more than a score of narrative poems, ballads and verse translations is the title poem, a religious allegory, which should appeal even to those not normally admirers of Mr. Masefield's style.

Mr. J. B. Priestley's *Delight* (Heinemann, 10s. 6d.) consists of 114 little essays, running from four lines to as many pages, on such diverse topics as Shakespeare rediscovered, a walk in a pine wood, the ironic principle, and smoking in a hot bath. If not the best of Mr. Priestley's books, this is perhaps the most difficult of them all to put down.

P. A. SPALDING.

Moffat's achievements are sometimes overshadowed by the more spectacular successes of David Livingstone. Mr. Hugh F. Frame's graphic biography *Moffat Leads The Way* (Livingstone Press, 4s. 6d.) enables the reader to perceive his greatness.

In *The Christ of the Ages* (Skeffington, 7s. 6d.) the Rev. A. Edley Willings describes the five epochs in the history of the Christian Church in which the living Christ has made His presence most powerfully known. A useful introduction to Christian history, which should prove of value among local preachers.

Dr. E. H. Hume's *Doctors East Doctors West* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is an account of his life as a physician in China. The Yale-in-China hospital and medical school at Changsha were founded by him some forty years ago, and he was there in the period when China was beginning to seek a knowledge of the Western approach to scientific medicine, and Westerners were trying to understand Chinese medical thought. Dr. Hume's desire and ability to understand the Chinese make his references to their medicine, and their way of life, of considerable importance. This account of his life is of value also as a literary effort.

The essays by Dr. Manfred Björkquist, the Bishop of Stockholm, in *A Life Worth Living* (Skeffington, 7s. 6d.) are singularly lucid and refreshing. Their real importance lies in Dr. Björkquist's understanding of the modern situation and his forceful presentation of what the Christian faith has to say on the topics about which he writes.

Mary of Magdala (S.P.C.K., for the Religious Drama Society, 4s.) is a remarkable play, in three acts, by Mr. Ernest Milton. Its presentation of the power of Christ over Mary rings true to the Gospel narrative, and is of great dramatic power. It will require acting of a high order.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

The Life of *William Paton* (S.C.M., 15s.) by Miss Margaret Sinclair is necessarily the account both of a man and of a movement, for the whole course of his life as well as the set of his mind directed William Paton to a central place in the development of the ecumenical movement. For his secretaryship of the International Missionary Council his personal experience of India was invaluable; and this experience, enlarged by extended journeys about the globe, enabled him to make a unique contribution to the World Council of Churches. He was not merely a globe-trotter. He was a clear thinker and hard worker in committee. He was also deeply constrained by the love of God in Christ; and this was the basis of his missionary fervour.

David Hill (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.), by the Rev. H. B. Rattenbury, is appropriately sub-titled *Friend of China*. Hill was a pioneer missionary of the Methodist Church—at his own charges—and a saint; though with some of the personal failings of a saint. No doubt Methodists and others will be interested to know of changes since Hill's day, but for us the book is spoiled rather than improved by Mr. Rattenbury's own experiences and his too frequent comments.

Successor to C. T. Studd (Lutterworth Press, 6s.), by Mr. Norman Grubb, is the story of Jack Harrison: born in a Liverpool slum, leaving school at 13, converted at 19, missionary in the Belgian Congo at 21, succeeding Studd as mission leader at 31, dead at 45. It is a very readable narrative, written with zest and appreciation of this leader of a Bible mission founded solely on faith. Some of us may be a little dubious about the mission's theological emphasis and its organization; but most of us would be more dubious about sharing such a sacrifice in faith alone.

K. W. WADSWORTH.

In his *Life and Times of Daniel Lindley* (Epworth, 21s.) Dr. Edwin W. Smith provides a fascinating biography of a pioneer missionary in South Africa, which is also a contribution to the history of South Africa and the United States, so well is it documented. His hero was a Presbyterian minister who joined the Natal team of the American Board and laboured for over forty years in South Africa. Associated with Robert Moffat, he drove a thousand miles by ox-waggon to evangelize the Matabele, then became the itinerant minister of the trekking Boers, when his parish included the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, and Natal. Thereafter he settled amongst the Zulus on the Natal coast. His trilingualism, fair-mindedness, statesmanship and Christian love are a challenge to South Africa today.

West African Religion, by Geoffrey Parrinder (Epworth, 10s. 6d.). Missionaries and teachers of comparative religion will welcome Dr. Parrinder's systematic exposition of West African polytheistic religion and customs, because monographs on religion have been rarely produced by anthropologists since the days of Frazer and Durkheim. Only a missionary with an intimate knowledge of West African religion, languages, and the researches of previous investigators in the field, could have produced so clear and comprehensive a synthesis.

The book is of particular importance because it will help all those whose concern it is to indigenize the Christian faith amongst Africans and who will be assisted to discover the points of contact between the Christian *communio sanctorum* and African ancestor worship, or between Christian confirmation or admission to full membership and initiation into the tribe. Indeed, if Dr. Parrinder were to follow this volume by a study of indigenization in West Africa our indebtedness would be increased. The competence of the present work indicates that he could perform for West Africans and their Christian instructors what Dr. Edwin Smith achieved for the Bantu in *African Beliefs and the Christian Faith*.

Dr. Parrinder is to be congratulated on bringing to light evidence hitherto inaccessible on the training of pagan priests in West Africa. This is carefully detailed in Chapter 8. Our admiration for this work is the greater because he has used the brief periods of rest he could snatch from the overworked life of a missionary to produce this doctoral thesis, which avoids the customary perils of pontificality, prolixity, and dullness. It will be a valuable addition to a bookshelf containing works on other aspects of the same subject by Edwin Smith, J. B. Danquah, and Willoughby.

The Story of the Prayer Book, by Percy Dearmer (O.U.P., 8s. 6d.).

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer, by Alan C. Don (S.P.C.K., 6s. 6d.).

Our Treasury of Praise and Prayer, by J. R. Darbyshire (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.).

The re-issue of the first, and the issue of the second and third volumes, coincides with the celebration of the quater-centenary of the Edwardian Book of Common Prayer in 1549. Dr. Dearmer's book is a popular history of the origin and development of the Prayer Book, excellently illustrated. Dr. Don's volume, for the specialist, describes the origin of the Scottish Prayer Book (commonly known as the "Laudian Liturgy"), with facsimiles of the title-pages of different editions. The late Archbishop of Cape Town has produced a felicitous commentary, historical and devotional, on the contents of the Prayer Book. It is curious that both Dr. Dearmer and Dr. Darbyshire continue to misrepresent the Puritans as gloomy fanatics.

HORTON DAVIES.

Jacob's Ladder, by Nicolete Gray (Faber, 21s.) is a lavish production. Some 60 pictures from Anglo-Saxon and 12th-century Mss. are used to illustrate the Bible story, which is told in the form of simple expository comment on the pictures. This book is intensely interesting to the adult student. But can it be wise to put these grim pictures of Hell and the Devil, and these grotesque pictures of Our Lord, before a child? Yet that is the writer's intention.

Of the fifteen writers who tell of their conversion to Roman Catholicism in *The Road to Damascus* (W. H. Allen, 10s. 6d.), nine are American. Some of the accounts are pieces of snappy journalism, while others are moving stories of hearts' pilgrimage. The book is impressive and instructive.

Rise and Build (Livingstone Press, 3s. 6d.) by Douglas W. Thompson deals with Christian reconstruction in Chinese rural areas. But it goes far beyond that. It faces all that is involved in the redemption of the whole life of sinful, poverty-stricken, hungry, sick and ignorant man.

The Rev. McEwan Lawson says that his book *The Bible* (Herbert Jenkins, 7s. 6d.) is "an attempt to answer simply, honestly and with as little technical jargon as possible, the questions which ordinary modern men and women ask about the Bible". It is irritating to find trivialities cheek by jowl with

matters of great moment. If the 350 or so questions had been reduced to 100, this might well have been a book of the first rank. Given something worthwhile to write about Mr. McEwan Lawson is fresh and sparkling. Teachers, Youth Club Leaders and Ministers will all find good stuff here: but the search for it calls for much patience. J. WILDING.

Into a pamphlet of 24 pages, *A Christian Philosophy of Sex* (S.C.M., 6d.), the Rev. T. R. Milford, Chancellor of Lincoln, has packed a great deal of wisdom on the subject of love and marriage, which is a healthy corrective to superficial views. He has also some good things to say on the "vocation" of celibacy.

Life and Growth (Faber, 6s.) by Miss C. M. Legge and the Rev. E. F. Rigby is described as "A supplementary reader on Sex Education suitable for use in the top class of a Primary School and the lower forms in a Secondary School". It is frank and simple in its treatment and will be useful to parents as well as teachers. The book has a religious background which is made explicit in the last two chapters. L. J. TIZARD.

Canon F. G. Belton's *A Manual for Confessors* (Mowbray, 12s. 6d.) is described as "A Guide to the Administration of the Sacrament of Penance" for use in the Anglican Church. It contains much of a pastoral nature that is common to all who have the ministerial oversight of a flock. But those of us who distrust deeply the whole practice of the Confessional are left wondering what rightful place the Confessional can have in the English Church. And to base the claims of the Confessor on the one verse in John xx is a highly doubtful line of exegesis.

Dr. Evelyn Frost's *Christian Healing* (Mowbray, 15s.) is a study of the place of Christian healing in the Church of today in the light of the practice of the Ante-Nicene Church. The first part is an interesting patristic study, well documented. The rest of the book is more controversial. Its final contention is that the Church must regain the lost art of healing by way of the Sacraments, including Penance.

The late Rev. Edgar Daplyn's translation of *The Imitation of Christ* (Latimer House, 6s.) is made from the full text of the Manuscript of 1441. It is a rendering into current English, and retains much of the naturalness of the original.

Dom. Hubert Van Zeller's *Moments of Light* (Burns Oates, 7s. 6d.) is valuable for its treatment of the early stages in mental prayer; and for its more advanced treatment of contemplative prayer. The book rests on a disciplined Christian mysticism; it is happily free from burdensome technicalities.

In *The Gospel We Preach* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5s.) Dr. Oswald J. Smith, of the People's Church, Toronto, writes chapters on the Gospel he preaches. There is individuality here; and a somewhat arresting self-confidence. The author knows what he believes, and can hit a mark.

On Prayer, by J. P. De Caussade (Burns, Oates, 12s. 6d.). This edition of Père de Caussade's *Spiritual Instructions* in an English translation contains both parts of the work; the first, his criticism of Quietism; the second, his discussion of Contemplative prayer, in the main on the lines of Bossuet. This classic of Jesuit devotion will appeal to those well advanced, and especially to Catholics. Some will feel that the simplicities of prayer are lost in a maze of rules made in a spiritual enclosure.

The Collected Letters of S. Thérèse of Lisieux, translated by F. J. Sheed (Sheed & Ward, 15s.); *Storm of Glory,* by John Beevers (Sheed & Ward, 10s. 6d.). These two books together give a trustworthy account of S. Thérèse, and of the cult of the Saint which has grown up since the Nun's death in 1897, at the age of twenty-four. Mr. Beevers' biography, *Storm of Glory,* is clear, and the outline of Thérèse's life is drawn sympathetically; about the happenings since, he has some distrust of their publicity and notoriety. The volume of "Letters" contains all the letters from Thérèse's childhood till her death. Thérèse was obviously an overstrung child, and the letters are too often those of an overwrought mind. She had a pure devotion of soul, of that there is no question; but the question of canonization is more difficult.

Dr. Leslie F. Church's *More about the Early Methodist People* (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.) follows in the main the lines of his previous volume, *The Early Methodist People;* it is a further study of the first Methodists, the manner of men they were, their aims and their ideals. They were, Dr. Church says, "a spiritual people with a remarkable awareness of the divine Presence at all times and in all places". They were much more representative of all classes in the country than is commonly understood. By many examples and simple character sketches Dr. Church brings to life men and women whose names are largely forgotten, but whose work and witness were the soul of the Revival. One of the best chapters is the account of the first local preachers; and whatever you may think of them, they had the power to move men. A very interesting chapter traces the growth of the forms of Methodist worship. There is also an instructive chapter on the attitude of the first Methodists to social service. It is the best answer to the shallow charge that the Revival put off social reform.

A. T. S. James.

The World Adrift, by Magnus Irvine (Christopher Johnson, 10s. 6d.). There is nothing novel in the realization that man's technical progress has outstripped his moral advance, but here the story is told in a way which reveals particularly clearly the one-sidedness of modern life and thought. "Man is still largely unaware of his dependence upon the unseen cosmic forces", because of his "primitive state of spiritual sensitivity". The author regards the modern restlessness as "the surest sign of life", and he believes that this unsettled mood can lead to a new Renaissance provided that Christianity dominates thought and action in private and public dealings.

They Made your World, by A. M. Low (John Gifford, 7s. 6d.), cramps the lives of 43 scientists within 172 pages. The author sees life from a technical angle alone. Otherwise he could hardly describe the theories replaced by Darwinian evolution as "old superstitions". Some of H. G. Wells' writing is "quite as wonderful as the Bible", but death, we are told, did not daunt him. Would readers of *Mind at the End of Its Tether* agree?

The Origins of Modern Science, by H. Butterfield (Bell, 10s. 6d.) is a penetrating analysis of the scientific revolution. Professor Butterfield reveals the work of such men as Copernicus and Harvey, Bacon and Boyle in its true relationship to the ascendant course of human thought. He shows particularly clearly the way in which habits of thought are taken over complete from previous generations, and the difficulty which faces the man who finds that the basis upon which his whole outlook has been built is inadequate.

R. W. Pilkington.

The Folk High Schools of Denmark, by H. Begtrup, H. Lund, and P. Manniche (O.U.P., 7s. 6d.), tells a straightforward story of the beginnings of the now well-known Danish Folk High Schools. One could have wished that some fresh interpretation might have been given to the material used. This book adds little to previous publications on the subject, notably ones by Peter Manniche himself.

Church, School and Life, by R. W. Stopford (O.U.P., 1s. 6d.), is a pithy statement of the attitude of the Christian Churches of Britain towards education today. It is well balanced and fair, and really does get down to essentials.

Education in Great Britain, by Professor W. O. Lester Smith (O.U.P., 5s.), will for long be a standard short introduction to its subject. It is the latest volume in the Home University Library, written by one who for many years was a distinguished Director of Education. The book is a miracle of compression, liberal and humane in its outlook, full of common sense and a perception of the national tradition. Every page is readable, yet full of facts and wise comment. It is difficult to find any trace either of denominational or of anti-religious bias. Professor Lester Smith in this book proves that he is a historian of sensitive and fine quality and a social thinker with high ideals, yet a knowledge of the possible.

W. R. Niblett.

Frank Jessup: Problems of Local Government in England and Wales (C.U.P., 3s. 6d.). The problems of local government have become acute in recent years and there are a number of popular volumes dealing with them. What is to be the relation between the Central Government and Local Authorities? What is the right size of a local government unit? How much longer can we carry on with voluntary service when the subjects dealt with are becoming every year more specialized? These problems Mr. Jessup deals with in a lucid and vigorous fashion, steering a course between the traditionalists on the one side and the fanatical "planners" on the other. The book is to be commended as an admirable statement of the subject together with some wise guidance on the method of approach.

A. V. Murray.

Recovery Starts Within. Edited by J. W. C. Wand (O.U.P., 6s.). This book gives us a sample of the message delivered during the recent mission to London. The first part of this volume is the course of addresses preached at St. Paul's by the Dean. What his audiences made of these it would be of great interest to discover, for they strike us as more academic than evangelistic. The second part of the mission, and so of this volume, was a series of lectures in three centres, designed to show "that Christianity had something to say with regard to public problems and communal life". All are good; and Bishop Neill on the breakdown of the family is first-class.

John Huxtable.

The Bible in Britain, by Canon F. Harrison (Nelson, 7s. 6d.), tells the story of English versions of the Bible from early Saxon attempts to the most recent translations of Monsignor Knox and Basic English. Excerpts are given in most cases, and this is particularly enlightening on the various sixteenth-century Bibles. The author shows a power of appreciation of the merits of all translations and has well disguised his own prejudices (if, indeed, he has any).

Two sumptuously produced books from Parrish Ltd. are *Mountains in Colour*, by Frank Smythe (25s.), and *Flower of Cities* (18s. 6d.). The former contains many a stirring episode of climbing, 57 superb colour photographs, and a style of narration appropriate to the grandeur of the subject matter. *Flower of Cities* is a book about London in which 22 authors survey various aspects of the city and its fascinating life. The story moves from East End to West End and sees the Londoner both gay and serious. There is writing both clever and elevated, and the illustrations, which include plates in colour and monochrome and original drawings, support the narrative more effectively than is often the case.

An Outline of New Testament Ethics, by Lindsay Dewar (Univ. of London Press, 8s. 6d.), is written, the author says, to be of service to the general reader. It begins by emphasizing the fact that the *N.T.* ethic is inexplicable apart from the teaching about God; in other words, it is an "ethic of the Holy Spirit". The teaching of Jesus, Paul, John, and the rest of the *N.T.* is treated consecutively, and the result is a book of sane judgment which achieves the aim it sets itself. One occasionally feels that the real point has been missed (*e.g.* on *scandalon*), but there are many fresh suggestions in detail, especially on the meaning of words, which is the main strength of the book. Insufficient account is taken of the motive of gratitude to God as Redeemer which is quite fundamental in *N.T.* ethics. E. C. B.

Equality, by David Thomson (C.U.P., 3s. 6d.). Dr. Thomson has written an important little book which deserves close attention. He studies the growth of equality in different fields of our common life, and here, perhaps, the really important things he has to say are said in connection with the achievement of legal equality. There is much fruitful description and comment in the discussions of religious, political and economic equality, and equality between nations.

Morality and God, by E. W. Hirst (Epworth Press, 6s.). In this thoughtful essay Dr. Hirst sets himself to prove that morality can have no final basis except in religion, and that ultimately the way we behave rests on what we believe about God. The life of human love is the only fitting life in a world where a God, who is Himself love, is the central fact. True, but many will feel that Dr. Hirst narrows the field of ethical action too much, for ethical action involves action and quality of life even when society is absent. Did Robinson Crusoe cease to be moral on his island? And is there not such a thing as the ethical use of the land, and of all the instruments of life? One wonders, too, whether Dr. Hirst has probed the conception of "oughtness" to the bottom, and whether he does in fact provide a surer basis for the sense of "oughtness" than does the humanist.

Spirit and Society, by Lawrence Hyde (Methuen, 10s. 6d.). In a world dominated by the humanistic outlook and seeking to find moral energy in purely humanistic motives, it is good to have this very thoughtful and hopeful book. The thesis is that the new humanistic emphasis on values as distinct from scientific facts points forward to a movement which is leading back to religion. There is in all reality, argues Mr. Hyde, but above all in persons, an "x" which escapes the scientist's net of judgment from numerical statistics. There is that in man which points to the reality of a spiritual world whose centre and origin is God. Only in relation to Him can man really find himself or found community. It is because we have forgotten this that our modern world wears an air of patchwork improvisation, self-destined to anarchy and frustration. The forward move towards order, discipline and freedom will probably be made by small voluntary

communities exploring the possibilities of personal and communal life as an expression of the character and will of God. This is definitely a book which will help to clearer thinking about the issues which confront both religion and society. B. C. PLOWRIGHT.

Dr. A. M. Chirgwin writes with informed authority on missions and the World Church, and this makes his *Decisive Decade* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) quite an event. It is in no sense local to the L.M.S. and shows the author in adequate succession to J. H. Oldham and Wm. Paton.

NELSON BITTON.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

A Remapping of the Bible World (New York: Nelson, $1) is a very serviceable and attractively produced collection of 44 maps designed to illustrate the text of the Bible. A. J. B. H.

Meet Yourself on Sunday (Naldrett Press, 3s. 6d.) is Mass Observation's report, in popular form, on the Sunday habits of a cross section of the British people. Many of the observations inevitably seem trite, but, as a factual study, they repay consideration. H. R. D.

What is happening to us? by V. A. Demant, D.Litt (Dacre, 2s. 6d.). This pamphlet is a foretaste of that great work on the Gospel and the renewal of civilization which we hope Professor Demant will give us soon. H. C. J.

All who believe in catholicity without feeling that the witness of the different denominations is an embarrassment will welcome *One Catholic and Apostolic Church* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). In these broadcast talks the point of view of five communions is expounded.

In *The Distinctive Free Church Witness Today* (R.E.P., 3s. 6d.) H. T. Wigley helps Free Churchmen to see why they are distinct from members of the Church of England, and why they should continue to be so. The obvious things are said positively and without vulgarity. E. C. B.

How Stands Reunion? by the Bishop of Lichfield (Lutterworth Press, 1s. 6d.). In this invaluable booklet Dr. Woods pleads the cause of reunion with a breadth of sympathy and depth of understanding that must appeal to Christians of all communions. G. K. H.

Pilgrim's Progress (S.P.C.K., 2s. 9d.). This complete dramatization of Bunyan's immortal story by Rodney Bennett has vitality and vigorous action; certainly it is the best of its kind. R. D.

Concerning Science, by F. Sherwood Taylor, Ph.D. (Macdonald & Co., 6s.). The author is the Curator of the Museum of the History of Science at Oxford. He gives a balanced account of what science is and what it is not. The book is designed to help the non-specialist to see how science can be set in its true place and become a means of power that shall fulfil the good desires of man.

Man, Science and Deity, by D. H. H. Martin (Watts, 1s.). The author is concerned to discredit religion in a scientific age but finds no satisfactory alternative.

The Universe and Dr. Einstein, by Lincoln Barnett (Gollancz, 5s.). This is another among many attempts to explain the present-day view of the physical universe in non-mathematical terms. The main ideas of the theory of relativity are extremely well presented, and the present state of our knowledge is aptly characterized. But the layman may still find himself disappointed by his inability to grasp the essential points. E. C.

Natural History. Mammals and Birds, by David Seth-Smith (Herbert Jenkins, 7s. 6d.). For the zoo man and his lucid descriptions there can be nothing but praise. If the nature of the quagga, the age of an elderly elephant, or the voice of the ostrich formulate themselves as problems within the minds of your children, here are the answers, excellently presented. R. W. P.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

For the subject of his inaugural lecture the new Professor of Philosophy at Cambridge, Professor G. H. von Wright chose *Form and Content in Logic* (C.U.P., 1s. 6d.); it was intended for those trained in the technical language of Cambridge logic, and by others will not be found easily intelligible. G. F. N.

Eddington, Man of Science and Mystic, by L. P. Jacks (C.U.P., 2s.). This, the second Eddington Memorial Lecture, will help the purpose of the foundation to maintain and further Eddington's concern for relating the scientific, the philosophical and the religious methods of seeking truth. Dr. Jacks unites with these the perception of the artist and the poet. E. C.

The Study of Christian Doctrine by A. E. J. Rawlinson (S.P.C.K., 1s.) surveys the development of Christian doctrine, recognizing that "the period of merely historical study of Christianity is at an end" and a new Dogmatic Theology is needed.

Some Lessons from Marcion (Birmingham: Churches of Christ, Berean Press, 1s. 3d.), by Dr. P. W. Evans, is the second Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture. It reviews the Marcionite heresy with a true sense of its relevance to our time.

E. C. B.

Middle East Archæology (Cumberlege, 2s. 6d.) is the 1949 Bryce Memorial Lecture by Sir L. Woolley.

In *Adult Education: what now?* (National Adult School Union, 6d.) Sir Fred Clarke is concerned with the voluntary agencies of adult education and their difficulties, dangers and possibilities in the present situation. A. V. M.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS

The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church, by Rev. R. Allen (World Dominion Press, 5s.).

A new impression of Lady Hosie's *Jesus and Woman* is available (Hodder & Stoughton, 8s. 6d.).

The Rev. Magnus C. Ratter's *Albert Schweitzer* (Lindsey Press, 8s. 6d.) is much enlarged in this second edition. This biography, written in a trenchant and individualistic style, ably describes the man and his brilliance as a musician, theologian, philosopher, and doctor in Africa.

Couriers of Christ (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.). Miss Joyce Reason has revised this short, vivid history of the London Missionary Society, by J. C. Harris.

Christ and the Early Church, by Harold Osborne (University Tutorial Press Ltd., 9s. 6d.), written from the standpoint of a guarded liberalism, may be useful to those cramming for an examination.

A Short History of the Jewish People, by Cecil Roth (East and West Library, 25s.). This is a revised and enlarged edition, illustrated beautifully, of a book that is indispensable to all students of Jewry.

The Cradle of God, by Llewelyn Powys (Watts, 8s. 6d.) theologically and historically has little to commend it.

When a book runs through twenty editions and is translated into nine languages and is still being reprinted in its fiftieth year of life, it has some right to be styled a classic. This handsome book, *Pastor Hsi,* by Mrs. Howard Taylor (China Inland Mission: Lutterworth Press, 8s. 6d.), deserves that description.

The new fifteenth edition of *Cassell's New English Dictionary* is both revised and enlarged. It is particularly good on scientific terms. There are a few curious omissions: *e.g.* if we are to have Americanisms, why *boloney* and not *finalise?* And why not *trafficator,* when we are given *traffic lights?* But this is good value for 17s. 6d.

The S.C.M. Press are to be congratulated on a new edition of Brunner's *Our Faith* at 7s. 6d. This book was written originally (in 1936) for young people ready for confirmation, and is a simple exposition of Christian belief. It deserves to be far better known than it is.

A Christian Year Book 1950 is most welcome (S.C.M. and Lutterworth Press). Its 304 pages now cost 7s. 6d. but are well worth it. Small blemishes are the wrong impression given of Family Church (p. 91), and a mistake about the name of the editor of this *Quarterly.*

ALSO RECEIVED

From Religious Education Press: *More Bible Models and how to make them* (2s.) by H. W. Whanslaw, and *The Young People's Concise Guide, 1950* (5s.).
Western Union, by Zane Grey (Pan Books, 2s.).
History of Modern Spiritualism, by E. Thompson (Two Worlds, 8s. 6d.).
The Proverbs of Solomon, ed. by A. D. Power (Longmans, 6s.).
Bishop Shanahan of S. Nigeria, by J. P. Jordan (Clonmore & Reynolds, 16s.).
Rural Welfare Services, by B. Y. Landis (Columbia Univ.; London, Cumberlege, 16s.).
Seek Ye First, by Cardinal Griffin (Sheed & Ward, 12s. 6d.).
From Epworth Press: *Yea, Lord* (J. E. Barker, 4s.); *Talking about God* (F. Greeves, 2s. 6d.); *Through the Eyes of their Wives* (W. J. May, 5s.); *Country Pleasure* (George Freshacres, 6s.); *George Jackson* (Mrs. Jackson, 7s. 6d.); *The Homely Year* (Dr. and Mrs. L. Church, 5s.).
Under the Barber's Pole, by T. Thompson (Allen & Unwin, 6s.).
Oliver Twist (New Oxford Illustrated Dickens, O.U.P., 8s. 6d.).
The Christ of God, by R. Clarke (Victory Press, 10s.).
From Livingstone Press: *Eagle Omnibus, No. 9* (2s. 6d.); *Peter: An Eskimo Boy* (2s.); *Heroes of the Faith* (1s. 6d.).
St. Columba of Iona, by L. Menzies (Iona Community, 5s.).
Shaken Mists, by J. Mackay (Skeffington, 5s.).

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Oct. and Jan.). The Rev. H. Trevor Hughes shows that Wesley was indebted to Jeremy Taylor, although he misunderstood his teaching on humility. The Swedish Lutheran, Prof. Gustaf Wingren, has two articles on "The Word of God in the Theology of Karl Barth". Further articles deal with "The Background of the New Testament Conception of Satan", "The Treatment of Disease in New Testament Times", and "Solitariness and Community in Religion in Whitehead's Philosophy".

Hibbert Journal (Oct. and Jan.). Contains Part II of the symposium on Autonomous Ethics, with papers on "Men without Conscience", "Ethics without Law", and "Autonomy and Politics". Prof. C. E. M. Joad writes on "Logical Positivism and Theory of Knowledge"; Prof. C. D. Broad on "Egotism as a Theory of Human Motives"; Dr. N. V. Banerjee on "The Essential Buddha"; and the Dean of St. Paul's on "The Nation and the Prayer Book".

International Review of Missions (Jan.). "A Survey of the Year 1949" by the Rev. Norman Goodall and Miss M. Sinclair occupies seventy-three pages, and is indispensable reading for all who claim to be well-informed about the world-wide work of the Christian mission. Other contributions include a report on the Latin American Evangelical Conference at Buenos Aires by Dr. B. F. Stockwell; and an account of the "Reorientation of Muslim Work in India and Pakistan".

Expository Times (Oct.-Jan.). The useful series on the Doctrine of Man is continued by Rev. T. P. Addison ("Man in the New Testament"); Dr. Lovell Cocks ("The Divine Image in Man"); Prof. H. Roberts ("Self-deception"); and Rev. G. Rupp ("The Christian and Secular Eschatology"). Prof. Foster writes on "Christianity and other Religions"; and Dr. J. H. Michael's article—"God and Magog in the Twentieth Century"—has a designedly topical flavour. Other contributions include "The Study of Hymnology and the Cause of Reunion" and "Poetry after Two Wars".

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Sept.). A number for scholars. Prof. T. W. Manson identifies *The Epistle to the Hebrews* with *The Epistle of Apollos to the Churches of the Lycus Valley*, though he confesses that this is no more than "a fairly probable guess". Prof. H. H. Rowley writes about "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age", and Dr. E. Robertson about "Investigations into the Old Testament Problem: The Results".

Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). The Rev. H. Bonser was a General Superintendent for twenty-six years (1923-49); he deals with the establishment of the Superintendency among Baptists and its growth in favour. Rev. E. A. Payne writes on "American Baptists: Northern and Southern", and Mr. F. M. W. Harrison contributes "Sidelights on Serampore".

Theology Today (Oct.). Prof. Tillich's weighty article on "The Present Theological Situation in the Light of the Continental European Development" is based on a recent visit to Germany. An editorial on "Our American Protestantism" is characterized by a refreshing candour: "that which is destroying us is an inward confusion as to the mission and message of Protestant or Evangelical Christianity". Prof. H. Kuhn on "Existentialism—Christian and Anti-Christian" and Prof. R. Hazelton on "The Nature of Christian Paradox" may usefully be read together; the latter suggests that paradox "had better be used at least as sparingly as in the Bible".

Presbyterian World (Sept. and Dec.). These numbers reflect largely the domestic affairs of international Presbyterianism. Prof. Hromadka, of Prague, gives an interpretation of the changed, and changing, religious situation in Czechoslovakia.

Scottish Congregationalist (Nov.-Feb.). An editorial expresses appreciation of the Communion Service recently broadcast from Mill Hill Congregational Church, but thinks that the commentary "was wholly unnecessary". A new series on Modern Prophets is begun: Rev. J. G. Drummond writes on Arnold Toynbee; Mr. J. Borthwick on Bertrand Russell; and Rev. J. B. Wilson on Karl Barth.

Religion in Life (Autumn). Prof. F. C. Grant touches practical levels of religious experience in an article on "The Divinity of Christ"; Dr. W. E. Sangster—"The Church's One Privation"—pleads for a revival of holiness. Reviews run to thirty pages and are by no means confined to American authors.

Yale Review (Autumn) beside articles of domestic interest has international issues well to the fore with Prof. N. Peffer ("Chinese Communism: Epoch or Episode"); Mr. E. W. Griffiths ("Retrospect on Germany"); and Dr. B. Dodge ("The Problem of the Palestine Refugees").

H. CUNLIFFE JONES.